

<b>Capitalism</b>
-------------------

Capitalism .....	1
1NC .....	2
1NC .....	3
1NC .....	4
Links—Transportation Technology .....	5
Links—Transportation Infrastructure .....	6
Links—Transportation Infrastructure .....	7
Links—Metro Infrastructure .....	8
Links—Renewable Energy .....	9
Links—Discourse .....	10
Links—Morality/Ethics .....	11
Links—Performance/Alternative Affs .....	12
Impacts—Extinction .....	13
Impacts—Value to Life .....	14
Impacts—No Value to Life .....	15
Impacts—Extinction .....	16
Impacts—Extinction .....	17
Impacts—Extinction .....	18
Impacts—Oppression/Extinction .....	19
Impacts—Genocide .....	20
Impacts—Nuclear War .....	21
Impacts—Environmental Collapse .....	22
Impacts—Racism .....	23
Alternative Solvency .....	24
Alternative Solvency .....	25
Alternative Solvency .....	26
Alternative Solvency .....	27
Capitalism in Crisis Now .....	28
Capitalism in Crisis Now .....	29
Capitalism in Crisis Now .....	30
AT: Alternative Does Nothing/Praxis Good .....	31
AT: Capitalism Inevitable .....	32
AT: Cap Sustainable .....	33
AT: Capitalism Solves Environment .....	34
AT: Capitalism Will Adapt to Environmental Changes .....	35
AT: Elites Kill Solvency .....	36
AT: Gibson-Graham .....	37
AT: Gibson-Graham (Alternative Solvency) .....	38
AT: Ivory Tower/Intellectuals Bad .....	39
AT: Methodological Criticism Bad .....	40
AT: Permutation .....	41
AT: Permutation .....	42
AT: Permutation .....	43
AT: Political Action Key .....	44
AT: Utopian Alternatives Bad .....	45
AT: Transition Wars .....	46
AT: New Technology Helps the Oppressed .....	47
AT: Framework .....	48
AT: Framework .....	49
AT: Transportation Infrastructure is Socialist .....	50
Aff—Capitalism Sustainable .....	51
Aff—Must Work Within Capitalism .....	52
Aff—Alternative→Transition War .....	53
Aff—Alternative→Transition War .....	54
Aff—Gibson-Graham .....	55
Aff—Cap Good—Environment .....	56
Aff—Framework .....	57
Aff—Transportation Infrastructure Not Capitalist .....	58

## 1NC

### Transportation Infrastructure is an Explicitly Political Tool to Organize Space to Benefit of the Powerful and Economic Elite

Zachary Callen, Prof of Political Science at Alleghany College, "THE SEAMS OF THE STATE: INFRASTRUCTURE AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS IN AMERICAN STATE BUILDING," Dissertation at the University of Chicago, 2009 (<http://gradworks.umi.com/3369449.pdf>)

However, beyond just shaping political subjects, space is itself also open to human manipulation and change. The values and ideals that physical structures impose on agents are not accidental or somehow inherently contained within the object. Instead, there are human agents actively shaping and altering space, as part of furthering of their preferred value system. Spatial form should not be considered natural or pre-given: space is built, maintained, and purposefully altered by human decisions. In actual practice, spatial organization itself arises through a confluence of natural conditions and political choices. On the one hand, space is an external factor, with local terrain, altitude, and climate not subject to human control. But, at the same time, how space is developed and the rules of usage for particular spaces are human constructs that directly shape spatial form. While not always easily altered, spatial forms are neither eternal nor endlessly repeating. Instead, organized and motivated actors can transform space, and through doing so also change the rules of the broader political field. While many of the spatial fields that human beings inhabit have some basis in the "natural environment," the majority of these spaces still inevitably primarily reflect human actions and values more than any natural geographic features (Gottdiener, 1997; Harvey, 2000; Jackson, 1994; Lefebvre, 1984; Soja, 2003). Hence, space is intrinsically dialectical, being both shaped by human choice while at the same time also molding human subjectivity. The capacity of political institutions to transform space and, in turn, the power of those transformation over individuals, is an enduring and widespread feature of social change. Thereby, spatial transformation is a key element of how states express their power (Mann, 1986). Spatial organization has been utilized by political agents in numerous contexts, across time, to pursue very specific goals. For instance, business interests utilize urban design to encourage consumption in modern cities. In a more political vein, European governments are currently reformulating urban environments to redirect economic development from the nation-state scale to the city-regional level, and ancient political leaders controlled local geography as a means to consolidate their power. With urban planning, national transportation infrastructure systems, and land usage guidelines, states can express their own values to the world, and more importantly, direct the behavior of their citizens. More practically, without sufficient or appropriate spatial organization between its constituent parts, a state is vulnerable to attack, disintegration, or economic stagnation (Brenner, 2004; Lefebvre, 2003; Smith, 8 2003). However, space's centrality to state power makes it an inherently contested political arena, as multiple actors within the state attempt to control and reformulate space in a manner that best suits their interests. This intensity of conflict results from the far-reaching implications that come with having the power to order space.

## 1NC

## Continued Economic Growth Will End All Complex Forms of Life—We Must Allow Recession to Take Hold to Re-Establish Viable Civilization—All Your Transition Bad Impacts are Non-Ux

Dr. Glen Barry, "Economic Collapse And Global Ecology," CounterCurrents.org, January 14th, 2008(<http://www.countercurrents.org/barry140108.htm>)

Given widespread failure to pursue policies sufficient to reverse deterioration of the biosphere and avoid ecological collapse, the best we can hope for may be that the growth-based economic system crashes sooner rather than later.

Humanity and the Earth are faced with an enormous conundrum -- sufficient climate policies enjoy political support only in times of rapid economic growth. Yet this growth is the primary factor driving greenhouse gas emissions and other environmental ills. The growth machine has pushed the planet well beyond its ecological carrying capacity, and unless constrained, can only lead to human extinction and an end to complex life.

With every economic downturn, like the one now looming in the United States, it becomes more difficult and less likely that policy sufficient to ensure global ecological sustainability will be embraced. This essay explores the possibility that from a biocentric viewpoint of needs for long-term global ecological, economic and social sustainability; it would be better for the economic collapse to come now rather than later.

Economic growth is a deadly disease upon the Earth, with capitalism as its most virulent strain. Throw-away consumption and explosive population growth are made possible by using up fossil fuels and destroying ecosystems. Holiday shopping numbers are covered by media in the same breath as Arctic ice melt, ignoring their deep connection. Exponential economic growth destroys ecosystems and pushes the biosphere closer to failure. Humanity has proven itself unwilling and unable to address climate change and other environmental threats with necessary haste and ambition. Action on coal, forests, population, renewable energy and emission reductions could be taken now at net benefit to the economy. Yet, the losers -- primarily fossil fuel industries and their bought oligarchy -- successfully resist futures not dependent upon their deadly products.

Perpetual economic growth, and necessary climate and other ecological policies, are fundamentally incompatible. Global ecological sustainability depends critically upon establishing a steady state economy, whereby production is right-sized to not diminish natural capital. Whole industries like coal and natural forest logging will be eliminated even as new opportunities emerge in solar energy and environmental restoration.

This critical transition to both economic and ecological sustainability is simply not happening on any scale. The challenge is how to carry out necessary environmental policies even as economic growth ends and consumption plunges. The natural response is going to be liquidation of even more life-giving ecosystems, and jettisoning of climate policies, to vainly try to maintain high growth and personal consumption.

We know that humanity must reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80% over coming decades. How will this and other necessary climate mitigation strategies be maintained during years of economic downturns, resource wars, reasonable demands for equitable consumption, and frankly, the weather being more pleasant in some places? If efforts to reduce emissions and move to a steady state economy fail; the collapse of ecological, economic and social systems is assured.

Bright greens take the continued existence of a habitable Earth with viable, sustainable populations of all species including humans as the ultimate truth and the meaning of life. Whether this is possible in a time of economic collapse is crucially dependent upon whether enough ecosystems and resources remain post collapse to allow humanity to recover and reconstitute sustainable, relocalized societies.

It may be better for the Earth and humanity's future that economic collapse comes sooner rather than later, while more ecosystems and opportunities to return to nature's fold exist. Economic collapse will be deeply wrenching -- part Great Depression, part African famine. There will be starvation and civil strife, and a long period of suffering and turmoil.

Many will be killed as balance returns to the Earth. Most people have forgotten how to grow food and that their identity is more than what they own. Yet there is some justice, in that those who have lived most lightly upon the land will have an easier time of it, even as those super-consumers living in massive cities finally learn where their food comes from and that ecology is the meaning of life. Economic collapse now means humanity and the Earth ultimately survive to prosper again.

Human suffering -- already the norm for many, but hitting the currently materially affluent -- is inevitable given the degree to which the planet's carrying capacity has been exceeded. We are a couple decades at most away from societal strife of a much greater magnitude as the Earth's biosphere fails. Humanity can take the bitter medicine now, and recover while emerging better for it; or our total collapse can be a final, fatal death swoon.

A successful revolutionary response to imminent global ecosystem collapse would focus upon bringing down the Earth's industrial economy now. As society continues to fail miserably to implement necessary changes to allow creation to continue, maybe the best strategy to achieve global ecological sustainability is economic sabotage to hasten the day. It is more fragile than it looks.

Humanity is a marvelous creation. Yet her current dilemma is unprecedented. It is not yet known whether she is able to adapt, at some expense to her comfort and short-term well-being, to ensure survival. If she can, all futures of economic, social and ecological collapse can be avoided. If not it is better from a long-term biocentric viewpoint that the economic growth machine collapse now, bringing forth the necessary change, and offering hope for a planetary and human revival.

## 1NC

## The Alternative is To Allow The System to Collapse—Exposing These Fractures Will Allow for Capitalism to Collapse, They Must Be Exploited as the Opportunity Arises

Slavoj Zizek , Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left, 2000, p. 322

I am fully aware of what one should call, without any irony, the great achievements of liberal capitalism: probably, never in human history have so many people enjoyed such a degree of freedom and material standard of living as in today's developed Western countries. However, far from accepting the New World Order as an inexorable process which allows only for moderate palliative measures, I continue to think, in the old Marxist vein, that today's capitalism, in its very triumph, is breeding new 'contradictions' which are potentially even more explosive than those of standard industrial capitalism. A series of 'irrationalities' immediately comes to mind: the result of the breathtaking growth of productivity in the last few decades is rising unemployment, with the long-term perspective that developed societies will need only 20 per cent of their workforce to reproduce themselves, with the remaining 80 per cent reduced to the status of a surplus from a purely economic point of view; the result of decolonization is that multinationals treat even their own country of origin as just another colony; the result of globalization and the rise of the 'global village' is the ghettoization of whole strata of the population; the result of the much-praised 'disappearance of the working class' is the emergence of millions of manual workers labouring in the Third World sweatshops, out of our delicate Western sight. . . The capitalist system is thus approaching its inherent limit and self-cancellation: for the majority of the population, the dream of the virtual 'frictionless capitalism' (Bill Gates) is turning into a night-mare in which the fate of millions' is decided in hyper-reflexive speculation on futures. From the very beginning, capitalist globalization - the emergence of capitalism as the world system - involved its exact opposite: the split, within particular ethnic groups, between those who are included in this globalization and those who are excluded. Today, this split is more radical than ever. On the one hand, we have the so-called 'symbolic class': not only managers and bankers, but also academics, journalists, lawyers, and so on - all those whose domain of work is the virtual symbolic universe. On the other, there are the excluded in all their variations (the permanently unemployed, the homeless, underprivileged ethnic and religious minorities, and so on). In between, there is the notorious 'middle class', passionately attached to the traditional modes of production and ecology (say, a qualified manual worker whose job is threatened), and attacking both extremes, big business and academics as well as the excluded, as 'un-patriotic', 'rootless' deviations. As is always the case with social antagonisms, today's class antagonism functions as the intricate interplay between these three agents, with shifting strategic alliances: the 'politically correct' symbolic classes defending the excluded against the 'fundamentalist' middle class, and so forth. The split between them is becoming even more radical than traditional class divisions - one is tempted to claim that it is reaching almost ontological proportions, with each group evolving its own 'world-view', its own relation to reality: the 'symbolic class' is individualistic, ecologically sensitive and simultaneously 'postmodern', aware that reality itself is a contingent symbolic formation; the 'middle class' sticks to traditional stable ethics and a belief in 'real life', with which symbolic classes are 'losing touch'; the excluded oscillate between hedonistic nihilism and radical (religious or ethnic) fundamentalism. Are we not dealing again with the Lacanian triad of Symbolic, Imaginary and Real? Are the excluded not 'real' in the sense of the kernel which resists social integration, and is the 'middle class' not 'imaginary', clinging to the fantasy of society as a harmonious Whole corrupted through moral decay? The main point of this improvised description is that globalization undermines its own roots: one can already perceive on the horizon the conflict with the very principle of formal democracy, since, at a certain point, the 'symbolic class' will no longer be able 'democratically' to contain the resistance of the majority. Which way out of this predicament will this class then resort to? Nothing is to be excluded, even up to genetic manipulation to render those who do not fit into globalization more docile.

## Links—Transportation Technology

### **The Creation of Technology for the Growth of Productivity is a Tool to Sustain Capitalism—Even Mass Transit that Enables Economic Growth is a Strategy to Benefit the Ruling Rather than the Working Class**

Kimberly Defazio, Professor of Humanities at Clarkson University, "Humanities and the City of Labor," RedCritique, Fall-Winter 2003 ([http://www.redcritique.org/FallWinter2003/printversions/humanitiesandthecityoflaborprint.htm\\_](http://www.redcritique.org/FallWinter2003/printversions/humanitiesandthecityoflaborprint.htm_))

Technology is one of the most important ways in which this intensification of exploitation takes place. By introducing new(er) technologies, capitalists can speed up and intensify the production process, so that more products can be made by fewer workers, which makes possible the firing of now "redundant" workers, workers whose jobs have been taken by machines.<sup>[2]</sup> This is, of course, what accounts for the continued growth of productivity in the US despite the loss of at least 3 million jobs under the Bush Administration. Moreover, as commodities require less and less labor to produce (since the same labor creates more commodities than it did before the new technology), the commodities produced are less and less valuable, meaning that necessary labor-time to reproduce the means of subsistence is decreased, and workers devote more time producing surplus value for the capitalist. Thus the ratio between what the workers receive in the form of wages (whether or not they are paid at value) and what the capitalist receives grows exponentially. Though technology is produced by labor, the benefits of technology are privatized, rather than used to meet the needs of all. Whether the wages are "fair" (market value) or not, the worker is exploited and increasingly receives less in return for her labor power, while the capitalist receives a greater share of surplus-value. Technology, in other words, is crucial for capitalists because it is on the basis of technological innovation that capitalists can gain a greater competitive edge and increase their profits relative to other capitalists who have not used the same advances in technology. Those capitalists who are on the cutting edge of production can undersell their product relative to other sellers because their product has been made with less labor, and therefore less necessary labor—and the capitalist can accumulate more surplus value. This in fact is the whole basis for the rapid revolutionizing of the forces of production that is specific to capitalism.

But what needs to be emphasized here is that although the innovations of technology are used to increase the rate of exploitation of the worker, this does not eliminate the fundamental property relation, which is a matter of private ownership of means of production (not just specific technologies); private command over surplus labor. The revolutionizing of production in capitalism (the shift from "industrial" to "postindustrial" capitalism) is still based on the exploitation of those who must sell their labor in order to survive. There has, in short, been no "break" in production, separating a later stage of capitalism from its exploitative past. Technology does not produce profit; human labor power does. Technology therefore cannot serve as the basis of capitalism now.

To turn back to Drucker, we can see that his claim that technology is the driving force of history and the implication that the main way to bring about social equality is to train more people in the information technologies corporations require, is based on an idealist theory of technology. For, technology is an ensemble of social relations, not an assemblage of autonomous objects and procedures. The materiality of technology is not in its object body but in the labor relations in which it is produced and used. This is another way of saying that technology does not change class relations. Contrary to post-al theory, technology does not bring about equality, democracy, or freedom, because it is not an autonomous object. Machines are social. They are the extension of the dominant social relations. That is, technology is both produced by human labor and it is the extension of the labor relations of society—the way people produce goods to meet their needs—and the relations that are organized around and determined by their mode of production. For instance, in a socialist society, in which production is not organized for profit but to meet the needs of all, technological advances are used to ensure that all people have access to housing, healthy diets, advanced education, complex culture, convenient public transportation. It is used in the collective interests of society, in order to advance social interests. By contrast, in capitalist society, in which the means of production are owned privately, advances in technology are used to accumulate profits for those who own it, rather than advance the collective interests of all. As a result, the very people who produce and work the technology, become, as Marx argues, appendages of the machines, for the main role of technology in this society is to increase the amount of surplus value produced by the worker. In capitalism all advances in technology are used to increase the wealth of owners, at the expense of the wage-laborers who produce it.

If advances in technology alone actually brought about equality, then the societies in which technology is most advanced would have the most economic equality. But just the reverse is true. The U.S., the most technologically advanced nation in the world, is also one of the most economically polarized. As even such mouthpieces of capital as the New York Times acknowledged at the height of the tech boom, "the growing concentration of American wealth and income challenge a cherished part of the country's self image: They show that rather than being an egalitarian society, the United States has become the most economically stratified of industrial nations" (Bradsher A1). With the crash of the technology bubble, such realizations are ever becoming the norm in bourgeois economic, political and cultural theory.<sup>[3]</sup>

## Links—Transportation Infrastructure

### **Transportation Technologies and the Rebuilding of Infrastructure are Designed to Serve Corporations and Provide Workers to Industry**

Kimberly Defazio, Professor of Humanities at Clarkson University, "Humanities and the City of Labor," RedCritique, Fall-Winter 2003 ([http://www.redcritique.org/FallWinter2003/printversions/humanitiesandthecityoflaborprint.htm\\_](http://www.redcritique.org/FallWinter2003/printversions/humanitiesandthecityoflaborprint.htm_))

The question of the rebuilding of "ground zero" is an urgent one. Not only will the labor of workers from around the world make the redevelopment of lower Manhattan possible, but millions of people's lives will be directly affected by what is built in its place, how the rebuilding takes place, and the interests it serves. What is rebuilt will have an impact for instance on workers' transportation, on the accessibility and affordability of their housing, on their jobs, wages and working conditions, and on their health (both accessibility of health care and environmental concerns). Most important of all, public funds (largely from the taxation of workers) will be financing the project, which will cost hundreds of millions of dollars and is taking place at a moment of record deficits, the layoffs of hundreds of thousands of employees, the elimination of welfare, and shocking cuts in education and food programs for poor children. A moment, in other words, in which enormous amounts of public resources have already been transferred to private corporations, in order to further privatize urban space. All working people therefore have an urgent interest in the direction of the redevelopment. Will the project continue privatizing and commodifying the city, or will it attempt to put the needs of people first? To talk about ground zero, in other words, is to talk about the priorities of the city and which interests will be served. But it is also to talk about the causes of existing economic inequalities and social divisions, and how these divisions are to be changed. It is in this context that the public debates over the future of the WTC site need to be situated.

In light of the social consequences of what the rebuilding of ground zero entails, how have the needs of the city been represented by dominant discourses? What are the "priorities" represented? Since notice was given of the architectural contest to determine which plans would guide the rebuilding of the World Trade Center, the "public debate" has focused around whether priority should be given to "cultural"/"commercial" interests or "financial" concerns. That is, whether emphasis should be on a suitable memorial, the rebuilding of a distinct skyline, places to shop, and cultural institutions, or whether rebuilding of the transportation infrastructure and financial markets. But this division, I argue, is largely a result of too narrow and localist a focus on particularities—a focus which reproduces the fundamental problems of post-al theory. One side views architecture and urban planning in culturalist terms, and as such posits culture as the site in which social divisions are healed through spaces in which people can come together (and shop), or "recognize" losses and "respect" each others cultural differences. The other side is more overtly concerned with the needs of capital today and therefore emphasizes newer and better transportation technologies, and the building up of waterfront areas and offices as a means of enticing corporations to locate in lower Manhattan. It is not that the other culturalist arguments are not also concerned with meeting the needs of capital. Rather, their capitulation to the needs of capital is more mediated, more "veiled", by substituting the freedom to consume for freedom from exploitation. Both positions thus argue for minor reforms of the capitalist city instead of insisting on the need for the transformation of the fundamental economic contradictions of the city. Somewhere between the culturalist and financial positions is a third position, which might be called a "cultural realist" position which pragmatically argues that a combination of cultural venues for shopping, jobs to support people's ability to shop, and a range of employment opportunities for people to earn money to consume are necessary to meet the needs of people in the city.

## Links—Transportation Infrastructure

### **Transportation Networks are Tools for the Spatial Organization of the State—Dynamics of the Affirmative are an Attempt to Force to Economic Patterns on the Citizenry**

Zachary Callen, Prof of Political Science at Allegheny College, "THE SEAMS OF THE STATE: INFRASTRUCTURE AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS IN AMERICAN STATE BUILDING," Dissertation at the University of Chicago, 2009 (<http://gradworks.umi.com/3369449.pdf>)

The transcontinental railroad was also the culmination of the national state expanding its role in American spatial organization, an intervention which first began with a series of federal land grants to state legislatures throughout the 1850s. By using various grants to support and thereby shape American railroads, Congress dramatically and permanently altered the American political and economic landscape in the mid-19th century. Such infrastructure projects, from canals to modern interstate highways, are a central aspect of a state's spatial organization. Spatial organization refers to the use of transportation infrastructure, regulation over the ownership and usage of land, as well as the placement of permanent settlements, notably cities and government installations (especially military posts), to determine how population, economic activity, and government power are distributed over sovereign territory. Significantly, spatial organization is neither a given of a particular environment nor is it a neutral process. Instead, any given location can be spatially arrayed in numerous forms, and spatial organization itself is the result of a political process in which actors compete to build space according to their own benefit. In the case of antebellum railroad development, by encouraging a direct connection between the Western frontier and the Atlantic coast, Congress subsidized manufacturing interests in the Atlantic coast, locked frontier areas into a pattern of agricultural and raw material production, and provided a backbone upon which a stronger centralized state power could be erected. Spatial organization, and especially transportation networks, are a particularly salient feature of state building, yet little attention is turned towards internal improvements in the current political development literature. Spatial organization is critical to state building because spatial form sets the terms of interaction among institutions as well as individuals, lubricating ties between some actors while at the same time hindering other connections. Further, spatial organization is a material action carried out on the world, lending it longevity and making any future alterations difficult and costly. Of the ways in which a government can alter its territory, transportation infrastructure is especially relevant for a state's spatial organization. More than other tools of spatial development, transportation systems define the movement of goods, ideas, and people within a state, as well as determining the scope of central administration.

**Links—Metro Infrastructure****The Infrastructure of the City is a Strategy to Sustain Global Finance**

Kimberly Defazio, Professor of Humanities at Clarkson University, "Humanities and the City of Labor," RedCritique, Fall-Winter 2003 ([http://www.redcritique.org/FallWinter2003/printversions/humanitiesandthecityoflaborprint.htm\\_](http://www.redcritique.org/FallWinter2003/printversions/humanitiesandthecityoflaborprint.htm_))

However, the relation of specific laboring activity to its useful effect (that is, the relation of the worker and the specific product of her work) does not explain where class inequality comes from—WHY it exists. This can only be explained by the fact that the worker labors in "a specifically social relation of production". It doesn't matter if a person produces knowledge, empties garbage bins, etc.: what matters is whether she privately owns the means of production and exploits the surplus-labor of others or sells her labor-power and is exploited. This is what determines class inequality. To put this differently, regardless of how many occupations are included to "fill in" the picture of globalization, what gets left out of Sassen's analysis is not only the underlying position in labor relations of high-skilled information technology labor and janitorial work (i.e., wage labor), but the fact that technology ("telematics") is congealed labor, and without this, there would be no economic transactions. It is not just a matter of who operates the technologies (whether it is a computer, phone system, or a broom)—but in who's interest these technologies are being used in the first place.

What is hidden in Sassen's "recovery" work is that the high-tech computers (not to mention the "low-tech" tools used by those who clean buildings) are produced by exploited labor. Without the living labor of workers, the telematics and financial transactions she privileges would not be possible. Moreover, what is being circulated in these transactions, (and what the entire service industry is geared toward facilitating), is the surplus value of workers. And, especially in the case of cybertechnologies, it is produced by workers in the South working under some of the most terrible and physically debilitating conditions, where for instance workers (primarily women) lose their sight within a matter of years. By focusing on cities and the infrastructures of cities that make possible global finance markets (from the law firms and advertising agencies to the nannies and wait people who "serve" the elite workers), what is erased is precisely the global division of labor Sassen claims to be concerned with.



**Links—Renewable Energy**

### **Renewable Energy Doesn't Fundamentally Change the Dynamics of Capitalist Economies, You Simply Enable Excessive Consumption**

Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. "Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society," 2007 (p. 128-29)

It is of the utmost importance to recognize that whether or not renewable energy can sustain consumer-capitalist society is not a matter of whether it can meet present energy demand. The essential question is whether it can enable constant increase in the volume of goods and services being consumed and the associated increase in energy demand. Energy demand is rising significantly, although estimates of future demand vary. ABARE's Energy Outlook 2000 shows that the average annual rate of growth in energy use in Australia over the decade of the 1990s was around 2.5% p.a. The Australian Yearbook shows that between 1982 and 1998 Australian energy use increased 50%, an arithmetical average growth rate of 3.13% p.a., and the rate has been faster in more recent years. (Graph 5.12.) However ABARE estimates that Australian energy demand will slow, reaching about 1.9% p.a. by 2040, meaning more than a doubling in annual use by then. In July 2003 Australian electricity authorities warned that blackouts are likely in coming years due to the rapid rate of increase in demand, estimated at almost 3% pa for the next five years. (ABC News, 31 July.) Robbins (2003) reports NEMMCO predicting electricity growth over the next 10 years in NSW, Queensland and Victoria as 3.1%, 3.5% and 2.6% p.a. respectively. Poldy (2005) shows that over the past 100 years Australian energy consumption has followed GDP growth closely, and he estimates that in recent years it has approximated a growth rate of 3.6% p.a. In 2004 world energy use jumped, growing at 4.3% p.a. (Catan, 2005.) Thus the commitment to growth greatly exacerbates the problem, and in turn all of the other resource supply problems, because all involve an energy component. For instance if the cost of fuel increases significantly, then so will the cost of food and minerals, and even university courses, because fuel is needed to produce them. It has been argued above that renewables are not likely to be capable of meeting present electricity and liquid fuel demand, but given the inertia built into growth trends, the demand to be met will probably be three or four times as big as it is now by mid century...and doubling every approximately 35 years thereafter. To summarise regarding Fault 1, consumer-capitalist society is obviously grossly unsustainable. We have far overshoot levels of production, consumption, resource use and affluence that are sustainable for ourselves over a long period of time, let alone extended to all the world's people. Yet our top priority is to increase them continuously, without limit. This is the basic cause of the many alarming sustainability problems now threatening our survival.

Links—Discourse

### Discourse is a Fundamental Distraction From the Materiality of Violence and Economics—The Alternative is Crucial to Focus on the Relevant Question of Class

Mas'ud Zavarzadeh, Department of English, Syracuse University, "The Stupidity That Consumption is Just as Productive as Production: In the Shopping Mall of the Post-Al Left," College Literature, 1994 (JSTOR)

The unsurpassable objectivity which is not open to rhetorical interpretation and constitutes the decided foundation of critique is the "outside" that Marx calls the "Working Day" (Capital 1: 340-416). ([France] willfully misrecognizes my notion of objectivity by confusing my discussion of identity politics and objectivity.) The working day is not what it seems: its reality, like the reality of all capitalist practices, is an alienated reality--there is a contradiction between its appearance and its essence. It "appears" as if the worker, during the working day, receives wages that are equal compensation for his labor. This mystification originates in the fact that the capitalist pays not for "labor" but for "labor power": when labor power is put to use it produces more than it is paid for. The "working day" is the site of the unfolding of this fundamental contradiction: it is a divided day, divided into "necessary labor"--the part in which the worker produces value equivalent to his wages--and the "other," the part of "surplus labor"--a part in which the worker works for free and produces "surplus value." The second part of the working day is the source of profit and accumulation of capital. "Surplus labor" is the OBJECTIVE FACT of capitalist relations of production: without "surplus labor" there will be no profit, and without profit there will be no accumulation of capital, and without accumulation of capital there will be no capitalism. The goal of bourgeois economics is to conceal this part of the working day, and it should therefore be no surprise that, as a protector of ruling class interests in the academy, [Hill], with a studied casualness, places "surplus value" in the adjacency of "radical bible-studies" and quietly turns it into a rather boring matter of interest perhaps only to the dogmatic. To be more concise: "surplus labor" is that objective, unsurpassable "outside" that cannot be made part of the economies of the "inside" without capitalism itself being transformed into socialism. Revolutionary critique is grounded in this truth--objectivity--since all social institutions and practices of capitalism are founded upon the objectivity of surplus labor. The role of a revolutionary pedagogy of critique is to produce class consciousness so as to assist in organizing people into a new vanguard party that aims at abolishing this FACT of the capitalist system and transforming capitalism into a communist society. As I have argued in my "Postality" [Transformation 1], (post)structuralist theory, through the concept of "representation," makes all such facts an effect of interpretation and turns them into "undecidable" processes. The boom in ludic theory and Rhetoric Studies in the bourgeois academy is caused by the service it renders the ruling class: it makes the OBJECTIVE reality of the extraction of surplus labor a subjective one--not a decided fact but a matter of "interpretation." In doing so, it "deconstructs" (see the writings of such bourgeois readers as Gayatri Spivak, Cornel West, and Donna Haraway) the labor theory of value, displaces production with consumption, and resituates the citizen from the revolutionary cell to the ludic shopping mall of [France]. Now that I have indicated the objective grounds of "critique," I want to go back to the erasure of critique by dialogue in the post-al left and examine the reasons why these nine texts locate my critique-al writings and pedagogy in the space of violence, Stalinism, and demagoguery. Violence, in the post-al left, is a refusal to "talk." "To whom is Zavarzadeh speaking?" asks [Williams], who regards my practices to be demagogical, and [Bernard-Donals] finds as a mark of violence in my texts that "The interlocutor really is absent" from them. What is obscured in this representation of the non-dialogical is, of course, the violence of the dialogical. I leave aside here the violence with which these advocates of non-violent conversations attack me in their texts, and cartoon. My concern is with the practices by which the post-al left, through dialogue, naturalizes (and eroticizes) the violence that keeps capitalist democracy in power. What is violent? Subjecting people to the daily terrorism of layoffs in order to maintain high rates of profit for the owners of the means of production or redirecting this violence (which gives annual bonuses, in addition to multi-million-dollar salaries, benefits, and stock options, to the CEOs of the very corporations that are laying off thousands of workers) against the ruling class in order to end class societies? What is violent? Keeping millions of people in poverty, hunger, starvation, and homelessness, and deprived of basic health care, at a time when the forces of production have reached a level that can, in fact, provide for the needs of all people, or trying to overthrow this system? What is violent? Placing in office, under the alibi of "free elections," postfascists (Italy) and allies of the ruling class (Major, Clinton, Kohl, Yeltsin) or struggling to end this farce? What is violent? Reinforcing these practices by "talking" about them in a "reasonable" fashion (that is, within the rules of the game established by the ruling class for limited reform from "within") or marking the violence of conversation and its complicity with the status quo, thereby breaking the frame that represents "dialogue" as participation, when in fact it is merely a formal strategy for legitimating the established order? Any society in which the labor of many is the source of wealth for the few--all class societies--is a society of violence, and no amount of "talking" is going to change that objective fact. "Dialogue" and "conversation" are aimed at arriv-ing at a consensus by which this violence is made more tolerable, justifiable, and naturalized.

## Links—Morality/Ethics

**Politics and Morality are Inseparable—the Attempt to Foreground an Ethical or Moral Reason to Take Action Within the Domain of Capitalism is the Ultimate Violation of Ethics Which Guarantees The Failure of Radical Politics**

Istavan MESZAROS, University of Sussex, *Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition*, 1995 p. 409-10

Politics and morality are so closely intertwined in the real world that it is hardly imaginable to confront and resolve the conflicts of any age without bringing into play the crucial dimensions of both. Thus, whenever it is difficult to face the problems and contradictions of politics in the prevailing social order, theories of morality are also bound to suffer the consequences. Naturally, this relationship tends to prevail also in the positive direction. As the entire history of philosophy testifies, the authors of all major ethical works are also the originators of the seminal theoretical works on politics; and vice versa, all serious conceptualizations of politics have their necessary corollaries on the plane of moral discourse. This goes for Aristotle as much as for Hobbes and Spinoza, and for Rousseau and Kant as much as for Hegel. Indeed, in the case of Hegel we find his ethics fully integrated into his *Philosophy of Right*, i.e. his theory of the state. This is why it is so astonishing to read in Lukács's 'Tactics and Ethics' that 'Hegel's system is devoid of ethics': a view which he later mellowed to saying that the Hegelian treatment of ethics suffers the consequences of his system and the conservative bias of his theory of the state. It would be much more correct to say that — despite the conservative bias of his political conception — Hegel is the author of the last great systematic treatment of ethics. Compared to that, the twentieth century in the field of ethics (as well as in that of political philosophy) is very problematical.

No doubt this has a great deal to do with the ever narrowing margin of alternatives allowed by the necessary mode of functioning of the global capital system which produces the wisdom of 'there is no alternative'. For, evidently, there can be no meaningful moral discourse on the premiss that 'there is no alternative'. Ethics is concerned with the evaluation and implementation of alternative goals which individuals and social groups can actually set themselves in their confrontations with the problems of their age. And this is where the inescapability of politics makes its impact. For even the most intensely committed investigation of ethics cannot be a substitute for a radical critique of politics in its frustrating and alienating contemporary reality. The slogan of 'there is no alternative' did not originate in ethics; nor is it enough to reassert in ethical/ontological terms the need for alternatives, no matter how passionately this is felt and predicated. The pursuit of viable alternatives to the destructive reality of capital's social order in all its forms without which the socialist project is utterly pointless — is a practical matter. The role of morality and ethics is crucial to the success of this enterprise. But there can be no hope of success without the joint re-articulation of socialist moral discourse and political strategy, taking fully on board the painful lessons of the recent past.

**Links—Performance/Alternative Affs**

### **There is No Externality to Capital—Your Advocacy is Entirely Contained Within the Function of Class Dynamics**

Slavoj Zizek "Censorship Today: Violence, or Ecology as a New Opium for the Masses," Lacan.com, 2008

(<http://www.lacan.com/zizecology1.htm>)

In spite of the infinite adaptability of capitalism which, in the case of an acute ecological catastrophe or crisis, can easily turn ecology into a new field of capitalist investment and competition, the very nature of the risk involved fundamentally precludes a market solution - why? Capitalism only works in precise social conditions: it implies the trust into the objectivized/"reified" mechanism of the market's "invisible hand" which, as a kind of Cunning of Reason, guarantees that the competition of individual egotisms works for the common good. However, we are in the midst of a radical change. Till now, historical Substance played its role as the medium and foundation of all subjective interventions: whatever social and political subjects did, it was mediated and ultimately dominated, overdetermined, by the historical Substance. What looms on the horizon today is the unheard-of possibility that a subjective intervention will intervene directly into the historical Substance, catastrophically disturbing its run by way of triggering an ecological catastrophe, a fateful biogenetic mutation, a nuclear or similar military-social catastrophe, etc. No longer can we rely on the safeguarding role of the limited scope of our acts: it no longer holds that, whatever we do, history will go on. For the first time in human history, the act of a single socio-political agent effectively can alter and even interrupt the global historical process, so that, ironically, it is only today that we can say that the historical process should effectively be conceived "not only as Substance, but also as Subject." This is why, when confronted with singular catastrophic prospects (say, a political group which intends to attack its enemy with nuclear or biological weapons), we no longer can rely on the standard logic of the "Cunning of Reason" which, precisely, presupposes the primacy of the historical Substance over acting subjects: we no longer can adopt the stance of "let the enemy who threatens us deploy its potentials and thereby self-destruct himself" - the price for letting the historical Reason do its work is too high since, in the meantime, we may all perish together with the enemy. Recall a frightening detail from the Cuban missile crisis: only later did we learn how close to nuclear war we were during a naval skirmish between an American destroyer and a Soviet B-59 submarine off Cuba on October 27 1962. The destroyer dropped depth charges near the submarine to try to force it to surface, not knowing it had a nuclear-tipped torpedo. Vadim Orlov, a member of the submarine crew, told the conference in Havana that the submarine was authorized to fire it if three officers agreed. The officers began a fierce, shouting debate over whether to sink the ship. Two of them said yes and the other said no. "A guy named Arkhipov saved the world," was a bitter comment of a historian on this accident.

**Impacts--Extinction****Capitalism is the Root Cause of War, Genocide, Environmental Destruction and Culminates in Nuclear Conflict**

Internationalist Perspective, "Capitalism and Genocide," 2000 (<http://www.geocities.com/wageslavex/capandgen.html>)

Mass death, and genocide, the deliberate and systematic extermination of whole groups of human beings, have become an integral part of the social landscape of capitalism in its phase of decadence. Auschwitz, Kolyma, and Hiroshima are not merely the names of discrete sites where human beings have been subjected to forms of industrialized mass death, but synecdoches for the death-world that is a component of the capitalist mode of production in this epoch. In that sense, I want to argue that the Holocaust, for example, was not a Jewish catastrophe, nor an atavistic reversion to the barbarism of a past epoch, but rather an event produced by the unfolding of the logic of capitalism itself. Moreover, Auschwitz, Kolyma, and Hiroshima are not "past", but rather futural events, objective-real possibilities on the Front of history, to use concepts first articulated by the Marxist philosopher Ernst Bloch. The ethnic cleansing which has been unleashed in Bosnia and Kosovo, the genocide of the Tutsis in Rwanda, the mass death to which Chechnya has been subjected, the prospect for a nuclear war on the Indian sub-continent, are so many examples of the future which awaits the human species as the capitalist mode of production enters a new millenium. Indeed, it is just such a death-world that constitutes the meaning of one pole of the historic alternative which Rosa Luxemburg first posed in the midst of the slaughter inflicted on masses of conscripts during World War I: socialism or barbarism!

## Impacts—Value to Life

### **Capitalism Undermines the Very Basis for Value—Neither Life Nor Anything Within that Life Can Be Valuable Within Commodification**

Ljubodrag Simonovic, Ph.D. Philosophy, "Basis of contemporary critical theory of capitalism." A New World is Possible, 2007 (<http://www.scribd.com/doc/236268/Basis-of-contemporary-critical-theory-of-capitalism>)

The final stage of a mortal combat between mankind and capitalism is in progress. A specificity of capitalism is that, in contrast to "classical" barbarism (which is of destructive, murderous and plundering nature), it annihilates life by creating a "new world" – a "technical civilization" and an adequate, dehumanized and denaturalized man. Capitalism has eradicated man from his (natural) environment and has cut off the roots through which he had drawn life-creating force. Cities are "gardens" of capitalism where degenerated creatures "grow". Dog excrement, gasoline and sewerage stench, glaring advertisements and police car rotating lights that howl through the night - this is the environment of the "free world" man. By destroying the natural environment capitalism creates increasingly extreme climatic conditions in which man is struggling harder and harder to survive – and creates artificial living conditions accessible solely to the richest layer of population, which cause definitive degeneration of man as a natural being. "Humanization of life" is being limited to creation of micro-climatic conditions, of special capitalistic incubators - completely commercialized artificial living conditions to which degenerated people are appropriate. The most dramatic truth is: capitalism can survive the death of man as a human and biological being. For capitalism a "traditional man" is merely a temporary means of its own reproduction. "Consumer-man" represents a transitional phase in the capitalism-caused process of mutation of man towards the "highest" form of capitalistic man: a robot-man. "Terminators" and other robotized freaks which are products of the Hollywood entertainment industry which creates a "vision of the future" degenerated in a capitalist manner, incarnate creative powers, alienated from man, which become vehicles for destruction of man and life. A new "super race" of robotized humanoids is being created, which should clash with "traditional mankind", meaning with people capable of loving, thinking, daydreaming, fighting for freedom and survival - and impose their rule over the Earth. Instead of the new world, the "new man" is being created - who has been reduced to a level of humanity which cannot jeopardize the ruling order. Science and technique have become the basic lever of capital for the destruction of the world and the creation of "technical civilization". It is not only about destruction achieved by the use of technical means. It is about technicization of social institutions, of interpersonal relations, of the human body. Increasing transformation of nature into a surrogate of "nature", increasing dehumanization of the society and increasing denaturalization of man are direct consequences of capital's effort, within an increasingly merciless global economic war, to achieve complete commercialization of both natural and the social environment. The optimism of the Enlightenment could hardly be unreservedly supported nowadays, the notion of Marx that man imposes on himself only such tasks as he can solve, particularly the optimism based on the myth of the "omnipotence" of science and technique. The race for profits has already caused irreparable and still unpredictable damage to both man and his environment. By the creation of "consumer society", which means through the transition of capitalism into a phase of pure destruction, such a qualitative rise in destruction of nature and mankind has been performed that life on the planet is literally facing a "countdown". Instead of the "withering away" (Engels) of institutions of the capitalist society, the withering away of life is taking place.

**Impacts– No Value to Life**

**Capitalism is monetarizes and commodifies all existence—there will never be value to life in the world of the aff— it's try or die to escape capitalism**

Joel **Kovel**, Alger Hiss Professor, Social Studies, Bard College, THE ENEMY OF NATURE: THE END OF CAPITALISM OR THE END OF THE WORLD, 2002, p. 141.

Capital produces egoic relations, which reproduce capital. The isolated selves of the capitalist order can choose to become personifications of capital, or may have the role thrust upon them. In either case, they embark upon a pattern of non-recognition mandated by the fact that the almighty dollar interposes itself between all elements of experience: all things in the world, all other persons, and between the self and its world: nothing really exists except in and through monetization. This set-up provides an ideal culture medium for the bacillus of competition and ruthless self-maximization. Because money is all that 'counts', a peculiar heartlessness characterizes capitalists, a tough-minded and cold abstraction that will sacrifice species, whole continents (viz. Africa) or inconvenient sub-sets of the population (viz. black urban males) who add too little to the great march of surplus value or may be seen as standing in its way. The presence of value screens out genuine fellow-feeling or compassion, replacing it with the calculus of profit-expansion. Never has a holocaust been carried out so impersonally. When the Nazis killed their victims, the crimes were accompanied by a racist drumbeat; for global capital, the losses are regrettable necessities.

**Impacts—Extinction****Capitalism is a Violent System, It Encourages Poverty, Destruction and Inevitable Nuclear War That Culminates in Extinction**

Sam Webb, Masters of Economics at the University of Connecticut, "War, Capitalism, and George W. Bush," 2004 (<http://www.pwww.org/article/view/4967/1/207/O>)

Capitalism was never a warm, cuddly, stable social system. It came into the world dripping with blood from every pore, as Marx described it, laying waste to old forms of production and ways of life in favor of new, more efficient manufacturing. Since then it has combined nearly uninterrupted transformation of the instruments of production with immense wealth for a few and unrelieved exploitation, insecurity, misery, and racial and gender inequality for the many, along with periodic wars, and a vast zone of countries imprisoned in a seemingly inescapable web of abject poverty. Yet as bad as that record is, its most destructive effects on our world could still be ahead. Why do I say that? Because capitalism, with its imperatives of capital accumulation, profit maximization and competition, is the cause of new global problems that threaten the prospects and lives of billions of people worldwide, and, more importantly, it is also a formidable barrier to humankind's ability to solve these problems. Foremost among these, in addition to ecological degradation, economic crises, population pressures, and endemic diseases, is the threat of nuclear mass annihilation. With the end of the Cold War, most of us thought that the threat of nuclear war would fade and with it the stockpiles of nuclear weapons. But those hopes were dashed. Rather than easing, the nuclear threat is more palpable in some ways and caches of nuclear weapons are growing. And our own government possesses the biggest stockpiles by far. Much like previous administrations, the Bush administration has continued to develop more powerful nuclear weapons, but with a twist: it insists on its singular right to employ nuclear weapons preemptively in a range of military situations. This is a major departure from earlier U.S. policy – the stated policy of all previous administrations was that nuclear weapons are weapons of last resort to be used only in circumstances in which our nation is under severe attack. Meanwhile, today's White House bullies demonize, impose sanctions, and make or threaten war on states that are considering developing a nuclear weapons capability. Bush tells us that this policy of arming ourselves while disarming others should cause no anxiety because, he says, his administration desires only peace and has no imperial ambitions. Not surprisingly, people greet his rhetorical assurances skeptically, especially as it becomes more and more obvious that his administration's political objective is not world peace, but world domination, cunningly couched in the language of "fighting terrorism." It is well that millions of peace-minded people distrust Bush's rhetoric. The hyper-aggressive gang in the Oval Office and Pentagon and the absolutely lethal nature of modern weapons of mass destruction make for a highly unstable and explosive situation that could cascade out of control. War has a logic of its own. But skepticism alone is not enough. It has to be combined with a sustained mobilization of the world community – the other superpower in this unipolar world – if the hand of the warmakers in the White House and Pentagon is to be stayed. A heavy responsibility rests on the American people. For we have the opportunity to defeat Bush and his counterparts in Congress in the November elections. Such a defeat will be a body blow to the policies of preemption, regime change, and saber rattling, and a people's mandate for peace, disarmament, cooperation, and mutual security. The world will become a safer place. In the longer run, however, it is necessary to replace the system of capitalism. With its expansionary logic to accumulate capital globally and its competitive rivalries, capitalism has an undeniable structural tendency to militarism and war. This doesn't mean that nuclear war is inevitable. But it does suggest that nuclear war is a latent, ever-present possibility in a world in which global capital is king. Whether that occurs depends in large measure on the outcome of political struggle.



**Impacts—Extinction****Failing to Challenge this Logic of Industrial Capitalism Will Spell the End of Humanity—We Must Change the Social Order to Survive**

Joel Kovel, Alger Hiss Professor, Social Studies, Bard College, *THE ENEMY OF NATURE: THE END OF CAPITALISM OR THE END OF THE WORLD*, 2002, p. 5.

As the world, or to be more exact, the Western, industrial world, has leapt into a prosperity unimaginable to prior generations, it has prepared for itself a calamity far more unimaginable still. The present world system in effect has had three decades to limit its growth, and it has failed so abjectly that even the idea of limiting growth has been banished from official discourse. Further, it has been proved decisively that the internal logic of the present system translates 'growth' into increasing wealth for the few and increasing misery for the many. We must begin our inquiry therefore, with the chilling fact that 'growth' so conceived means the destruction of the natural foundation of civilization. If the world were a living organism, then any sensible observer would conclude that this 'growth' is a cancer that, if not somehow treated, means the destruction of human society, and even raises the question of the extinction of our species. A simple extrapolation tells us as much, once we learn that the growth is uncontrollable. The details are important and interesting, but less so than the chief conclusion — that irresistible growth, and the evident fact that this growth destabilizes and breaks down the natural ground necessary for human existence, means, in the plainest terms, that we are doomed under the present social order, and that we had better change it as soon as possible if we are to survive.

## Impacts—Extinction

### Capitalism Fosters a Hegemonic Imperialism Which Can Only Culminate in Extinction

John Foster, Editor, "Naked Imperialism," MONTHLY REVIEW, SEPTEMBER, 2005

From the longer view offered by a historical-materialist critique of capitalism, the direction that would be taken by U.S. imperialism following the fall of the Soviet Union was never in doubt. Capitalism by its very logic is a globally expansive system. The contradiction between its transnational economic aspirations and the fact that politically it remains rooted in particular nation states is insurmountable for the system. Yet, ill-fated attempts by individual states to overcome this contradiction are just as much a part of its fundamental logic. In present world circumstances, when one capitalist state has a virtual monopoly of the means of destruction, the temptation for that state to attempt to seize full-spectrum dominance and to transform itself into the de facto global state governing the world economy is irresistible. As the noted Marxian philosopher István Mészáros observed in *Socialism or Barbarism?* (2001)—written, significantly, before George W. Bush became president: "[W]hat is at stake today is not the control of a particular part of the planet—no matter how large—putting at a disadvantage but still tolerating the independent actions of some rivals, but the control of its totality by one hegemonic economic and military superpower, with all means—even the most extreme authoritarian and, if needed, violent military ones—at its disposal."

The unprecedented dangers of this new global disorder are revealed in the twin cataclysms to which the world is heading at present: nuclear proliferation and hence increased chances of the outbreak of nuclear war, and planetary ecological destruction. These are symbolized by the Bush administration's refusal to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to limit nuclear weapons development and by its failure to sign the Kyoto Protocol as a first step in controlling global warming. As former U.S. Secretary of Defense (in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations) Robert McNamara stated in an article entitled "Apocalypse Soon" in the May–June 2005 issue of *Foreign Policy*: "The United States has never endorsed the policy of 'no first use,' not during my seven years as secretary or since. We have been and remain prepared to initiate the use of nuclear weapons—by the decision of one person, the president—against either a nuclear or nonnuclear enemy whenever we believe it is in our interest to do so." The nation with the greatest conventional military force and the willingness to use it unilaterally to enlarge its global power is also the nation with the greatest nuclear force and the readiness to use it whenever it sees fit—setting the whole world on edge. The nation that contributes more to carbon dioxide emissions leading to global warming than any other (representing approximately a quarter of the world's total) has become the greatest obstacle to addressing global warming and the world's growing environmental problems—raising the possibility of the collapse of civilization itself if present trends continue.

The United States is seeking to exercise sovereign authority over the planet during a time of widening global crisis: economic stagnation, increasing polarization between the global rich and the global poor, weakening U.S. economic hegemony, growing nuclear threats, and deepening ecological decline. The result is a heightening of international instability. Other potential forces are emerging in the world, such as the European Community and China, that could eventually challenge U.S. power, regionally and even globally. Third world revolutions, far from ceasing, are beginning to gain momentum again, symbolized by Venezuela's Bolivarian Revolution under Hugo Chávez. U.S. attempts to tighten its imperial grip on the Middle East and its oil have had to cope with a fierce, seemingly unstoppable, Iraqi resistance, generating conditions of imperial overstretch. With the United States brandishing its nuclear arsenal and refusing to support international agreements on the control of such weapons, nuclear proliferation is continuing. New nations, such as North Korea, are entering or can be expected soon to enter the "nuclear club." Terrorist blowback from imperialist wars in the third world is now a well-recognized reality, generating rising fear of further terrorist attacks in New York, London, and elsewhere. Such vast and overlapping historical contradictions, rooted in the combined and uneven development of the global capitalist economy along with the U.S. drive for planetary domination, foreshadow what is potentially the most dangerous period in the history of imperialism.

## Impacts—Oppression/Extinction

**Capitalism Creates Oppression, Slavery, Violence, Warfare and Extinction**

Deborah Cook, Professor of Philosophy, University of Windsor, "Staying Alive: Adorno and Habermas on Self-Preservation Under Late Capitalism," 2006 ( <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/08935690600748173>)

In the passage in *Negative Dialectics* where he warns against self-preservation gone wild, Adorno states that it is "only as reflection upon ... self-preservation that reason would be above nature" (1973, 289). To rise above nature, then, reason must become "cognizant of its own natural essence" (1998b, 138). To be more fully rational, we must reflect on what Horkheimer and Adorno once called our underground history (1972, 231). In other words, we must recognize that our behavior is motivated and shaped by instincts, including the instinct for self-preservation (Adorno 1998a, 153). In his lectures on Kant, Adorno makes similar remarks when he summarizes his solution to the problem of self-preservation gone wild. To remedy this problem, nature must first become conscious of itself (Adorno 2000, 104). Adopting the Freudian goal of making the unconscious conscious, Adorno also insists that this critical self-understanding be accompanied by radical social, political, and economic changes that would bring to a halt the self-immolating domination of nature. This is why mindfulness of nature is necessary but not sufficient to remedy unbridled self-preservation. In the final analysis, society must be fundamentally transformed in order rationally to accommodate instincts that now run wild owing to our forgetfulness of nature in ourselves. By insisting on mindfulness of nature in the self, Adorno champions a form of rationality that would tame self-preservation, but in contrast to Habermas, he thinks that the taming of self-preservation is a normative task rather than an accomplished fact. Because self-preservation remains irrational, we now encounter serious environmental problems like those connected with global warming and the greenhouse effect, the depletion of natural resources, and the death of more than one hundred regions in our oceans. Owing to self-preservation gone wild, we have colonized and destabilized large parts of the world, adversely affecting the lives of millions, when we have not simply enslaved or murdered their inhabitants outright. Famine and disease are often the result of ravaging the land in the name of survival imperatives. Wars are waged in the name of self-preservation: with his now notoriously invisible weapons of mass destruction, Saddam Hussein was said to represent a serious threat to the lives of citizens in the West. The war against terrorism, waged in the name of self-preservation, has seriously undermined human rights and civil liberties; it has also been used to justify the murder, rape, and torture of thousands. As it now stands, the owners of the means of production ensure our survival through profits that, at best, only trickle down to the poorest members of society. Taken in charge by the capitalist economy, self-preservation now dictates that profits increase exponentially to the detriment of social programs like welfare and health care. In addition, self-preservation has gone wild because our instincts and needs are now firmly harnessed to commodified offers of satisfaction that deflect and distort them. Having surrendered the task of self-preservation to the economic and political systems, we remain in thrall to untamed survival instincts that could well end up destroying not just the entire species, but all life on the planet.

**Impacts—Genocide****Capitalism Operates Under the Logic of Genocide—a Capitalist World Guarantees Holocaust**

Joel Kovel, Alger Hiss Professor, Social Studies, Bard College, *THE ENEMY OF NATURE: THE END OF CAPITALISM OR THE END OF THE WORLD*, 2002, p. 141.

Capital produces egoic relations, which reproduce capital. The isolated selves of the capitalist order can choose to become personifications of capital, or may have the role thrust upon them. In either case, they embark upon a pattern of non-recognition mandated by the fact that the almighty dollar interposes itself between all elements of experience: all things in the world, all other persons, and between the self and its world: nothing really exists except in and through monetization. This set-up provides an ideal culture medium for the bacillus of competition and ruthless self-maximization. Because money is all that 'counts', a peculiar heartlessness characterizes capitalists, a tough-minded and cold abstraction that will sacrifice species, whole continents (viz. Africa) or inconvenient sub-sets of the population (viz. black urban males) who add too little to the great march of surplus value or may be seen as standing in its way. The presence of value screens out genuine fellow-feeling or compassion, replacing it with the calculus of profit-expansion. Never has a holocaust been carried out so impersonally. When the Nazis killed their victims, the crimes were accompanied by a racist drumbeat; for global capital, the losses are regrettable necessities.

## Impacts—Nuclear War

The World of Capitalism Makes Nuclear Conflict an Inevitable Outcome of World Relations  
Istvan Mezaros, Prof. of Philosophy @ Univ. of Sussex. Monthly Review. January, 2000, p. lexis

Given the way in which the ongoing trends of global development assert themselves, in a clearly identifiable way, we may have perhaps a few decades to bring to a halt their destructiveness, but certainly not centuries. The great liberal economist, Schumpeter, used to characterize—and idealize—capitalism as a system of “productive destruction.” This was, on the whole, true of capital’s ascending phase of development. Today, by contrast, we have reached a stage when, instead of “productive destruction,” we are even increasingly confronted by capital’s destructive production, proceeding on a frightening scale. You ask: “do you think that great mass movements have a chance to blossom again” in the age of globalization and under the “third way” of European social democracy? For me the “third way” is nothing more than a wishful fantasy, in defense of the established, untenable, order. Sociologists like Max Scheler have been predicting for almost a century the merging of the classes into a happy “middle-class”—one could only wonder: the middle of what? In reality, social polarization in our time is greater than ever before, making a mockery of the old social democratic expectations of eliminating—or at least greatly reducing—inequality through “progressive taxation.” As things turned out, we saw the diametrical opposite. To give you just two, very recent, examples: 1.) according to the Budget Office of the U.S. Congress (no “left-wing exaggerator,” for sure), the income of the top 1 percent is equivalent to that of the bottom one hundred million people, i.e. nearly 40 percent of the population. Twenty years ago it was “only” 1 percent against forty-nine million, i.e., less than twenty percent of the U.S. population. Some “equalization” and “merging of the classes into one another!” 2.) In England child poverty trebled in the last twenty years, and continued to be aggravated under the “New Labour” government in the last two and a half years. The “new labour” government preaches the vacuous “third way” sermon, and practices with ever greater severity the politics of antilabor measures, imposing even such policies which Mrs. Thatcher did not dare to introduce, cutting the Welfare State in every possible way, including even the precarious livelihood of the handicapped. Only a fool can assume that this can go on forever. So, in answer to your question, I am firmly convinced that there is a future for a radical mass movement, not only in England but also in the rest of the world. Or, to put it another way, if there is no future for such a movement, there can be no future for humanity itself. If I had to modify Rosa Luxemburg’s dictum, in relation to the dangers we face, I would add to “socialism or barbarism:” “barbarism if we are lucky”—in the sense that extermination of humankind is the ultimate concomitant of capital’s destructive course of development. And the world of that third possibility, beyond the alternatives of “socialism or barbarism,” would be fit only for cockroaches, which are said to be able to endure lethally high levels of nuclear radiation. This is the only rational meaning of capital’s third way.

## Impacts—Environmental Collapse

**Capitalism's expansion requires the subordination of nature to resources to be exploited, making ecological destruction of massive proportions inevitable.**

**Foster 07** (John Bellamy, Professor of Sociology at University of Oregon, The Ecology of Destruction, Feb 2007, <http://www.monthlyreview.org/0207jbf.htm>) JXu

In the almost five years that have elapsed since the second earth summit it has become increasingly difficult to separate the class and imperial war inherent to capitalism from war on the planet itself. At a time when the United States is battling for imperial control of the richest oil region on earth, the ecology of the planet is experiencing rapid deterioration, marked most dramatically by global warming. Meanwhile, neoliberal economic restructuring emanating from the new regime of monopoly-finance capital is not only undermining the economic welfare of much of humanity, but in some regions is removing such basic ecological conditions of human existence as access to clean air, drinkable water, and adequate food. Ecologists who once warned of the possibility of future apocalypse now insist that global disaster is on our doorstep. Bill McKibben, author of The End of Nature, declared in his article "The Debate is Over" in the November 17, 2005, issue of Rolling Stone magazine that we are now entering the "Oh Shit" era of global warming. At first, he wrote, there was the "I wonder what will happen?" era. Then there was the "Can this really be true?" era. Now we are in the Oh Shit era. We now know that it is too late to avert global disaster entirely. All we can do is limit its scope and intensity. Much of the uncertainty has to do with the fact that "the world...has some trapdoors—mechanisms that don't work in straightforward fashion, but instead trigger a nasty chain reaction."<sup>6</sup> In his book, The Revenge of Gaia, influential scientist James Lovelock, best known as the originator of the Gaia hypothesis, has issued a grim assessment of the earth's prospects based on such sudden chain reactions.<sup>7</sup> Voicing the concerns of numerous scientists, Lovelock highlights a number of positive feedback mechanisms that could—and in his view almost certainly will—amplify the earth warming tendency. The destructive effect of increasing global temperatures on ocean algae and tropical forests (on top of the direct removal of these forests) will, it is feared, reduce the capacity of the oceans and forests to absorb carbon dioxide, raising the global temperature still further. The freeing up and release into the atmosphere of enormous quantities of methane (a greenhouse gas twenty-four times as potent as carbon dioxide) as the permafrost of the arctic tundra thaws due to global warming, constitutes another such vicious spiral. Just as ominous, the reduction of the earth's reflectivity as melting white ice at the poles is replaced with blue seawater is threatening to ratchet-up global temperatures.<sup>8</sup> In Lovelock's cataclysmic view, the earth has probably already passed the point of no return and temperatures are destined to rise eventually as much as 8° C (14° F) in temperate regions. The human species will survive in some form, he assures us. Nevertheless he points to "an imminent shift in our climate towards one that could easily be described as Hell: so hot, so deadly that only a handful of the teeming billions now alive will survive."<sup>9</sup> He offers as the sole means of partial salvation a massive technical fix: a global program to expand nuclear power facilities throughout the earth as a limited substitute to the carbon-dioxide emitting fossil fuel economy. The thought that such a Faustian bargain would pave its own path to hell seems scarcely to have crossed his mind. Lovelock's fears are not easily dismissed. James Hansen, who did so much to bring the issue of global warming to world attention, has recently issued his own warning.

In an article entitled "The Threat to the Planet" (New York Review of Books, July 13, 2006), Hansen points out that animal and plant species are migrating throughout the earth in response to global warming—though not fast enough in relation to changes in their environments—and that alpine species are being "pushed off the planet." We are facing, he contends, the possibility of mass extinctions associated with increasing global temperature comparable to earlier periods in the earth's history in which 50 to 90 percent of living species were lost. The greatest immediate threat to humanity from climate change, Hansen argues, is associated with the destabilization of the ice sheets in Greenland and Antarctica. A little more than 1° C (1.8° F) separates the climate of today from the warmest interglacial periods in the last half million years when the sea level was as much as sixteen feet higher. Further, increases in temperature this century by around 2.8° C (5° F) under business as usual could lead to a long term rise in sea level by as much as eighty feet, judging by what happened the last time the earth's temperature rose this high—three million years ago. "We have," Hansen says, "at most ten years—not ten years to decide upon action but ten years to alter fundamentally the trajectory of greenhouse gas emissions"—if we are to prevent such disastrous outcomes from becoming inevitable. One crucial decade, in other words, separates us from irreversible changes that could produce a very different world. The contradictions of the entire Holocene—the geological epoch in which human civilization has developed—are suddenly being revealed in our time.<sup>10</sup> In the Oh shit era, the debate, McKibben says, is over. There is no longer any doubt that global warming represents a crisis of earth-shaking proportions. Yet, it is absolutely essential to understand that this is only one part of what we call the environmental crisis. The global ecological threat as a whole is made up of a large number of interrelated crises and problems that are confronting us simultaneously. In my 1994 book, The Vulnerable Planet, I started out with a brief litany of some of these, to which others might now be added: Overpopulation, destruction of the ozone layer, global warming, extinction of species, loss of genetic diversity, acid rain, nuclear contamination, tropical deforestation, the elimination of climax forests, wetland destruction, soil erosion, desertification, floods, famine, the despoliation of lakes, streams, and rivers, the drawing down and contamination of ground water, the pollution of coastal waters and estuaries, the destruction of coral reefs, oil spills, overfishing, expanding landfills, toxic wastes, the poisonous effects of insecticides and herbicides, exposure to hazards on the job, urban congestion, and the depletion of nonrenewable resources.<sup>11</sup> The point is that not just global warming but many of these other problems as well can each be seen as constituting a global ecological crisis. Today every major ecosystem on the earth is in decline. Issues of environmental justice are becoming more prominent and pressing everywhere we turn. Underlying this is the fact that the class/imperial war that defines capitalism as a world system, and that governs its system of accumulation, is a juggernaut that knows no limits. In this deadly conflict the natural world is seen as a mere instrument of world social domination. Hence, capital by its very logic imposes what is in effect a scorched earth strategy. The planetary ecological crisis is increasingly all-encompassing, a product of the destructive uncontrollability of a rapidly globalizing capitalist economy, which knows no law other than its own drive to exponential expansion.

**Impacts—Racism****Capitalism is a Racist System, As Long as there is Commodity Exchange There Will Be Racist Practices**

Bob Avakian, Chairman, Revolutionary Communist Party, "What Will It Take?" REVOLUTIONARY WORKER, March 23, 1997. (<http://rwor.org/a/firstvol/890-899/899/ask899.htm>)

B.A.: It is true, and it is a real problem, that people have been brainwashed with the dog-eat-dog mentality and that people, in particular white people in the U.S., have been indoctrinated with racist ideas. This is something that requires a great deal of attention and struggle. The question is: how are we going to change this, and what is the relation between changing the basic relations in society and changing people's thinking? The fact is that these backward ideas that do hold sway in society as a whole reflect the exploitative and oppressive relations that form the foundation of capitalist society and reinforce and perpetuate those relations. How are people brainwashed and indoctrinated with this mentality? Through the mass media, the educational system and other means through which ideas are spread and drummed into people's heads. And who controls these mass media and other means of communication and indoctrination? The capitalist rulers of society, who control all of the political structures and institutions and the spheres of ideology and culture (the superstructure of society) on the basis of their control of the economic foundation of society and their organization of production through relations of exploitation. In this capitalist economic system, the great majority of society is under the domination of the few who monopolize the means of production (land, factories, machines, and so on) and therefore monopolize the wealth produced. Because of all this, we will never be able to win people away from racism and the dog-eat-dog mentality just by arguments and reasoning alone, no matter how true and how powerful our arguments and reasoning may be. Arguments and reasoning alone can never change the basic economic, social, and political conditions in capitalist society which not only promote backward thinking but, more fundamentally, FORCE people into dog-eat-dog relations with each other and STRUCTURE things so that exploitation is the "engine" driving society, so that white supremacy and male supremacy are woven into the very fabric of society, so that inequality is THE RULE in society.

## Alternative Solvency

### **The Refusal to Participate in the Capitalist Economy is the Precondition For Changing the Economic Foundation of the World**

John Holloway, Professor of Political Science at the Universidad Puebla, "Changing the world without taking power," Endpage, 2003 ([endpage.org/articles](http://endpage.org/articles))

In the beginning is the scream. We scream. When we write or when we read, it is easy to forget that the beginning is not the word, but the scream. Faced with the mutilation of human lives by capitalism, a scream of sadness, a scream of horror, a scream of anger, a scream of refusal: NO. The starting point of theoretical reflection is opposition, negativity, struggle. It is from rage that thought is born, not from the pose of reason, not from the reasoned-sitting-back-and-reflecting-on-the-mysteries-of-existence that is the conventional image of 'the thinker'. We start from negation, from dissonance. The dissonance can take many shapes. An inarticulate mumble of discontent, tears of frustration, a scream of rage, a confident roar. An unease, a confusion, a longing, a critical vibration. Our dissonance comes from our experience, but that experience varies. Sometimes it is the direct experience of exploitation in the factory, or of oppression in the home, of stress in the office, of hunger and poverty, or of state violence or discrimination. Sometimes it is the less direct experience through television, newspapers or books that moves us to rage. Millions of children live on the streets of the world. In some cities, street children are systematically murdered as the only way of enforcing respect for private property. In 1998 the assets of the 200 richest people were more than the total income of 41% of the world's people (two and a half billion). In 1960, the countries with the wealthiest fifth of the world's people had per capita incomes 30 times that of the poorest fifth: by 1990 the ratio had doubled to 60 to one, and by 1995 it stood at 74 to one. The stock market rises every time there is an increase in unemployment. Students are imprisoned for struggling for free education while those who are actively responsible for the misery of millions are heaped with honours and given titles of distinction, General, Secretary of Defence, President. The list goes on and on. It is impossible to read a newspaper without feeling rage, without feeling pain. between them, that they are all part of a world that is flawed, a world that is wrong in some fundamental way. We see more and more people begging on the street while the stock markets break new records and company directors' salaries rise to ever dizzier heights, and we feel that the wrongs of the world are not chance injustices but part of a system that is profoundly wrong. Even Hollywood films (surprisingly, perhaps) almost always start from the portrayal of a fundamentally unjust world - before going on to reassure us (less surprisingly) that justice for the individual can be won through individual effort. Our anger is directed not just against particular happenings but is against a more general wrongness, a feeling that the world is askew, that the world is in some way untrue. When we experience something particularly horrific, we hold up our hands in horror and say 'that cannot be! it cannot be true!' We know that it is true, but feel that it is the truth of an untrue world. What would a true world look like? We may have a vague idea: it would be world of justice, a world in which people could relate to each other as people and not as things, a world in which people would shape their own lives. But we do not need to have a picture of what a true world would be like in order to feel that there is something radically wrong with the world that exists. Feeling that the world is wrong does not necessarily mean that we have a picture of a utopia to put in its place. Nor does it necessarily mean a romantic, some-day-my-prince-will-come idea that, although things are wrong now, one day we shall come to a true world, a promised land, a happy ending. We need no promise of a happy ending to justify our rejection of a world we feel to be wrong. That is our starting point: rejection of a world that we feel to be wrong, negation of a world we feel to be negative.



## Alternative Solvency

### **We Must Embrace Despair, Only The Refusal to Hope Can Transform Capitalist Politix**

Joel Jay Kassiola, San Fran State, "Questions to Ponder in Understanding the Modern Predicament", Explorations in Environmental Political Theory, 2003

The American illusion about domestic invincibility from foreign attack was dramatically destroyed. Likewise, I contend that our social fantasies of environmental limitlessness, ceaseless economic growth, and endless material prosperity must be exposed and discarded because of environmental finitude. The resulting experience of a mourning period for these fantasies will produce a despair that can transform our industrial way of life to one that is more consistent with reality: a postindustrial society that is environmentally sustainable and socially just.

This is where the emerging field of environmental political theory (as exemplified in this volume) can play a vital role by examining and analyzing where and why our industrial civilization is incompatible with the environmental planetary limits and to then prescribe changes that are more in line with these limits. In this manner, environmental political theory can be instrumental in saving our planet from environmental disaster. In this instance, the path to joy will lead through the political despair of our industrial fantasies articulated by environmental political theorists and the corresponding social transformation advocated by them. Could there be a more important field of study?

I think despair led us to this profound transformational political process after the September 11 attacks. I hope—unlike the pessimistic prayer options of Woody Allen—that a shock in the environmental realm equivalent to the September 11 attacks will not be necessary before a commitment to social transformation occurs. We still have time to prevent a shocking, despair-inducing environmental disaster costing tens of thousands or even millions of human and animal lives. Ominously, in the ecological domain, a "surprise" event, one that we have not even conceived of as a threat such as a global-scale environmental catastrophe like the sudden, extreme climate change with all of its threatened dimensions may not allow us the opportunity to change, or give us the time to experience despair to achieve the required social transformation by giving up our illusory socioeconomic fantasies.

Social psychologist and theorist Erich Fromm captured an important point about social illusions when he said: "One needs to destroy illusions in order to create the conditions that make illusions unnecessary."<sup>6</sup> Following this point of Fromm's, I maintain that despair—as illusion busting or fantasy ending—is vitally important to the conduct of political theory whereby our illusions can be burst so that a society not dependent on them and their deleterious consequences may be created. Futurist Alvin Toffler termed the challenge facing us the "awesome but exhilarating task that few generations in human history have ever faced: the design of a new civilization."<sup>7</sup>

My conclusion is that the path to success in this "awesome but exhilarating task" of designing a new civilization, a new civilization that is consistent with both environmental limits and social justice, must occur through the salutary experience of despair because new social values, and new social institutions based on them, are urgently needed. It is imperative, I believe, that we recognize, discard, and finally, mourn for and replace our industrial illusions that are both ecologically fatal and morally undesirable, and that have become globally hegemonic since 1989. In this essential respect, the despair of the aftermath of September 11 can prove to be a lesson of paramount importance for humankind, the planet, and all of its living species, demonstrating the surprising value and necessity of despair.[p. 192-197]

## Alternative Solvency

### EMBRACING THE HISTORICAL MISSION OF LABOR TO OVERTHROW CAPITAL IS THE ONLY WAY TO FOSTER A UNIVERSAL CONSCIOUSNESS AND REPLACE THE SYSTEM

AVAKIAN (Chairman of Revolutionary Communist Party) 1999[Bob, "We Have a New Millenium—What we Need is a New World", Revolutionary Worker #1036, Dec. 26, p. online: <http://rwor.org/a/v21/1030-039/1036/millenium.htm>)]

The "New Millennium" is before us. But what awaits us and future generations, what will define the next thousand years?

Will it be the same old, same old—where a small handful continues to control the wealth and knowledge humanity as a whole has created? Where this handful continues to rule over millions and billions, using the most brutal and destructive means to maintain a way of life in which the great majority of humanity is kept in conditions of poverty and wretchedness. Where the institutions of power...the machinery that enforces "law and order"...the customs, traditions, values and ideas with which people are indoctrinated...all serve to keep this kind of system going. Where 40 thousand children die every day in the Third World from starvation and disease that could be prevented or cured. Where the oppressed are treated like dogs and shot down in the streets, or even in their own homes, by the thugs in uniform who "protect and serve" this system. Where discrimination and racism are the rule. Where every day women are insulted and assaulted, and are constantly told it is their "natural role" to be under the domination of "male authority." Where whole peoples and nations are plundered by a few "great powers." Where those who rule over us can unleash massive destruction and war at their command, bringing great suffering to the people and threatening the future of humanity, and this is all justified and glorified as "duty, honor, and righteousness." For another thousand years, will people have to witness the sickening celebration of this as "the best of all possible worlds" and the most humanity can ever hope to achieve?

NO. This new millennium will be a time unlike any before in human history. It will be an era in which all of human society will be changed in radically new ways. It will be a world-historical epoch in which there will be the chance, in a way there never has been before, to put an end to oppression, to slavery in every form, in every part of the world.

Looking at the world as it is now, as it has been for thousands of years...seeing what the people are caught up in today...HOW CAN ANYONE CONFIDENTLY PROCLAIM THAT THE FUTURE IS BRIGHT, THAT THIS IS WHAT THE NEW MILLENNIUM WILL BRING?

AM I DREAMING? YES—BUT THESE DREAMS ARE BASED ON REALITY.

Check out history. No empire has lasted forever. Even the mightiest have fallen: the Roman Caesars and their descendants, the Pharaohs of Egypt, the empire of Alexander the Great, the ruling dynasties throughout thousands of years in China, and more recently the empires of the Spanish, Portuguese and others in the Americas. This will also happen to today's empire-rulers, the imperialists, whose system is rooted in the "modern" form of slavery known as capitalism. They may rule over large parts of the world today—and, like the empires of old, they challenge each other for the top-dog position—but they will be brought down. This will be true of the German, the British, the Japanese, the French, the Russian, and other imperialists. And, even though they like to declare that they are invincible and will forever be "all-powerful," this same fate awaits the mightiest of all world powers today, the U.S. imperialists.

BUT the BIG QUESTION is: WHAT WILL REPLACE THE RULE OF THESE IMPERIALISTS WHEN THEY FALL?

This has everything to do with how these imperialists are brought down—in what way this is achieved and by whom. If, as in the past, empires are overthrown by other empires—if exploiters are brought down to the dust only to have new exploiters arise in their place—then nothing fundamental will change and the masses of people, living under the rule of these imperialists, will not see a new day. BUT that is NOT the only way things can go—that is not the way imperialism will end. There is another road before us—the road of revolutionary struggle to overturn and uproot all imperialists, all systems of exploitation and oppression, to sweep away all their garbage. And that revolutionary struggle will give birth to a new society and a new world without exploitation and oppression. HOW CAN WE KNOW THIS IS POSSIBLE?

The reason is that, as a result of thousands of years of historical development and creative activity and struggle by human beings in all parts of the world, a fantastic amount of technology and knowledge has been brought forth. BUT this has taken place through various forms of society in which the few have enslaved the many, in different ways, and have reaped for themselves the benefits of all this development. AND THE PROBLEM TODAY IS THAT, IN THE HANDS OF THE CAPITALIST CLASS THAT RULES OVER US AND STILL CONTROLS HUMANITY'S FATE, THE TREMENDOUS TECHNOLOGY AND KNOWLEDGE THAT IS CREATED CANNOT BE USED FOR THE BENEFIT OF HUMANITY AS A WHOLE AND INSTEAD CAN ONLY SUBJECT THE GREAT MAJORITY OF US TO AGONY AND OPPRESSION. That is a problem for us, yet it is also a problem for THEM, because it makes clear that THIS CLASS OF CAPITALIST EXPLOITERS CANNOT RUN SOCIETY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE PEOPLE.

BUT THERE IS A CLASS THAT CAN DO THIS. This class is the proletariat. The proletariat is all of us—of all races and nationalities, in the U.S. and throughout the world—who, under this system, can live only so long as we work, and can work only so long as our work enriches someone else—the capitalist class. Our labor, collectively, is the foundation of society and produces tremendous wealth, but this wealth is stolen by a small number of capitalist exploiters who turn this wealth into their "private property," into a means of further exploiting us. We are trapped in this cycle, where we have to work in order to live but the more we work, the more wealth we create, the more it is stolen and turned into power over us. Acting as individuals, we cannot change this basic condition of enslavement, but as a class we do have a revolutionary way out.

Once we have risen up together and thrown off the rule of capital, we can not only free ourselves, we can revolutionize all of society and the world. We can unleash the tremendous creative potential of the masses of people—creative potential that is now wasted, or distorted, or even destroyed under the capitalist-imperialist system. We can take hold of the means to produce and acquire wealth and knowledge, make them the common property of the people and use them to benefit the people and society as a whole. We can transform all of the institutions and relations in society and the culture and ideas so that the common good is promoted and served. This is our world-historic mission. In this, we represent the great majority of the people, and we can lead them to change the world. This can happen—there is a powerful basis for this to happen—because this is the only way the needs and interests of the vast majority of humanity can be met and that humanity can move forward together. And, until this revolution is brought about, the rule of capital will continue to create conditions that force people to rebel against it. As the great communist revolutionary Mao Tsetung put it: wherever there is oppression, there will be resistance. And resistance can and will be transformed into revolutionary struggle, and ultimately revolutionary war, to defeat the forces of oppression on the battlefield, to smash their machinery of oppression, and to create a new system that puts an end to this oppression. No matter how many times this revolutionary struggle may be defeated, or turned back after winning some beginning victories, it will arise again and again until, finally, it triumphs completely and carries out its mission worldwide. Mao Tsetung also powerfully expressed this great truth: Fight, fail; fight again, fail again; fight again...until final victory—that is the logic of the people. Make trouble, fail; make trouble again, fail again...until their doom—that is the logic of the imperialists and all reactionaries.

But to make this a reality, the oppressed, and in particular the class of proletarians, must become conscious of this historic revolutionary mission. And those who come to see the need for revolution and are determined to fight for it must be organized as a powerful force at the core of this world-changing struggle. This means that the proletariat must have its own vanguard party. A party that is continually strengthened by sinking its roots and its organization ever more deeply among the proletariat and other oppressed people and by recruiting into the party those who come to the forefront in the revolutionary struggle. A party that is guided by communist ideology, by the scientific world outlook and method that today is called MLM (or Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, after the three greatest leaders of the communist cause so far: Marx, Lenin, and Mao). This ideology of MLM, and only this ideology, represents the proletariat and its revolutionary mission. The MLM party must take up and concretely apply this ideology to solve the practical problems of the revolution.

## Alternative Solvency

### The Revolution is Premised on Consciousness Raising—The Alternative's Raising of Consciousness Can Be the Spark

Bob Avakian, Chairman, Revolutionary Community Party, "We Have a 'New Millenium'--What We Need is a New World," REVOLUTIONARY WORKER December 26, 1999. (<http://rwor.org/a/v21/1030-039/1036/millenium.htm>)

The MLM party must take up and concretely apply this ideology to solve the practical problems of the revolution. In an imperialist country like the U.S., this means leading the masses of people in fighting against the outrages and injustices of this system, *and to do this in a way that prepares for the great revolutionary showdown ahead--the revolutionary war that will finally overthrow this system.* The party must develop, through all its work, and all the struggles of today, the fighting capacity and organization of the proletariat and its allies. It must continually develop the *class consciousness* of the proletariat--an understanding of what is the problem and what is the solution, who is the enemy and who are friends and potential allies, how the struggle has to be waged and what the final aim of that struggle is. It must enable growing numbers of people to see the necessity and possibility of the historic mission of communism and train the revolutionary-minded people in the scientific world outlook and method of communism. *In the U.S. today, there is such a party carrying out this revolutionary work--the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA.* And, in turn, our Party is part of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement (RIM), uniting MLM parties and organizations throughout the world. The purpose and goal of all these parties and organizations who are united in the RIM is to develop the worldwide proletarian revolution toward the final aim of communism--a world without exploitation, without inequality, without oppressive relations based on distinctions of class, or sex, or race or nationality. It is a tremendous achievement of the revolutionary struggle of masses of people in the U.S. and all over the world that our Party and the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement exist; and this Party and this Movement are tremendously important forces for the masses of people in fighting for their liberation. We call on our class, the proletarians, on all oppressed people, on everyone who would love to see a radically different world, where the great creative potential of the people is not beaten down and twisted into chains on the people themselves--where instead this potential is unlocked and unleashed to serve humanity.

## Capitalism in Crisis Now

### **Capitalism Will Inevitably Collapse—We are Witnessing the Saturation and Explosion of the System as We Approach its Structural Limits—Apologists of Capital Must Come to Face the Impending Crisis**

Istavan MESZAROS, University of Sussex, *Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition*, 1995p. 438-9

NEVERTHELESS, we may speak of the age of transition to socialism meaningfully in that:

Capital is presented with a dangerously narrowing range of feasible alternatives to the full activation of its structural crisis. Thus:

the shrinking size of the world directly controlled by private capital in the twentieth century;

the sheer magnitude of the resources required for displacing its contradictions, within the constraints of an ominously diminishing return;<sup>3t5</sup>

the slowly emerging saturation of the global framework of profitable capital production;<sup>3i9</sup>

— the chronic difficulties encountered in and generated by raising the necessary revenue for keeping in existence the parasitic sections of capital, at the expense of its productive parts;

the noticeable weakening of the ideological power of manipulative institutions (which were originally established under the circumstances of postwar economic expansion and its twin brother: the 'welfare state') at times of recession and growing 'structural unemployment'.

Characteristically, this is the only context in which the apologists of capital have, at long last, taken notice of the existence of structural conditions and determinations. But, of course, the admission that unemployment is now 'structural' is stated — with a logic worthy of capital's 'analytical' wisdom — not so as to call for a change in the structure (the social order) in which such consequences are unavoidable. On the contrary, in order to justify and maintain the selfsame structure intact, at whatever human cost, accepting 'structural unemployment' as the permanent feature of the one and only conceivable structure.

We can see here, again, the 'eternalization of bourgeois conditions', even in the face of a dramatically obvious and highly disturbing historical development. Yesterday the oracle said: 'Full Employment in a Free Society' (see the Lib-Labouring Lord Beveridge's book of the same title); today it talks about 'structural unemployment'. But, of course, nothing has really changed, and especially: nothing ought to change. For unemployment is 'structural', and therefore it is here to stay to the end of time. All these trends indicate a very real movement towards the ultimate limits of capital as such, and hence they show the historical actuality of a painful but inescapable process of transition.

## Capitalism in Crisis Now

### **Compromise Within the System Only Has the Potential to Preserve Capitalist Economies—The Crisis Now Will Collapse It**

Istavan MESZAROS, University of Sussex, *Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition*, 1995 p. 937

Today, one hundred years after Marx's death, we are a great deal closer to the conditions of capital's global breakdown and to the real possibility of that fundamental transformation which his work was meant to identify with scientific rigour and socialist passion. Naturally, it would be rather naive to suggest that from now on there will be no more outlets for capital's further expansion and for the displacement of many of its problems with the full involvement of the state. Equally, however, no one should doubt that we are in the midst of a crisis never experienced before on anything like a comparable scale. Accordingly, not only are the stakes getting higher and the confrontations sharper, but also the possibilities of a positive outcome are set in a new historical perspective. For precisely because the stakes are getting higher and potentially more explosive, the storehouse of compromises that formerly served so well the forces of unchallenged 'consensus politics' is also becoming more depleted, thereby blocking certain roads and opening up some others while calling for the adoption of new strategies.

## Capitalism in Crisis Now

### **Capitalism Has Expanded Beyond its Own Limits—Inevitably It Will Collapse Back Upon Itself**

Istavan MESZAROS, University of Sussex, *Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition*, 1995 p. 37

In the course of the last century capital has certainly invaded and subdued every corner of our planet, little and large alike. However, it proved quite incapable of solving the grave problems which people must confront in their everyday life all over the world. If anything, the penetration of capital into every single corner of the underdeveloped world only aggravated these problems. It promised 'modernization', but after many decades of loudly trumpeted intervention it only delivered intensified poverty, chronic indebtedness, insoluble inflation, and crippling structural dependency. So much so in fact that it is now highly embarrassing to remind the ideologists of the capital system that not so long ago they nailed their flags to the mast of 'modernization'.

Things have significantly changed in the last few decades, as compared to the expansionary past. The displacement of capital's inner contradictions could work with relative ease during the phase of the system's historical ascendancy. It was possible to deal under such conditions with many problems by sweeping them under the carpet of unfulfilled promises, like modernization in the 'Third World' and ever greater prosperity and social advancement in the 'metropolitan' countries, predicated on the expectation of producing an endlessly growing cake. However, the consummation of capital's historical ascendancy radically alters the situation. It is then not only no longer possible to make plausible new sets of vacuous promises but the old promises too must be wiped out of memory, and some real gains of the working classes in the privileged capitalist countries must be 'rolled back' in the interest of the survival of the ruling socioeconomic and political order.

This is where we stand today. The triumphalist celebrations of a few years ago now sound very hollow indeed. The slanted development of the last century brought no solutions on the model of 'mobile property's civilized victory' (Marx), in that it simply multiplied the privileges of the few and the misery of the many. However, a radically new condition has emerged in the course of the last few decades, gravely affecting the prospects of development in the future. For what is particularly grave today from the point of view of the capital system is that even the privileges of the few cannot be sustained any longer on the backs of the many, in sharp contrast to the past. As a result, the system as a whole is being rendered quite unstable, even if it will take some time before the full implications of this systemic instability transpire, calling for structural remedies in place of manipulative postponement.

## AT: Alternative Does Nothing/Praxis Good

### The Temptation to Act is Basis of Capitalist Economics—Only By Embracing Criticism and Resisting the Call to Praxis Can We Put Up a Truly Radical Politix Which Stands a Chance Against Capital

Slavoj Zizek, Revolution at the Gates, p. 169-171

Indeed, since the “normal” functioning of capitalism involves some kind of disavowal of the basic principle of its functioning (today’s model capitalist is someone who, after ruthlessly generating profit, then generously shares parts of it, giving large donations to churches, victims of ethnic or sexual abuse, etc., posing as a humanitarian), the ultimate act of transgression is to assert this principle directly, depriving it of its humanitarian mask. I am therefore tempted to reverse Marx’s Thesis 11: the first task today is precisely not to succumb to the temptation to act, to intervene directly and change things {which then inevitably ends in a cul-de-sac of debilitating impossibility: “What can we do against global capital?”}, but to question the hegemonic ideological co-ordinates. In short, our historical moment is still that of Adorno: to the Question “What should we do?” I can most often truly answer with “I don’t know.” I can only try to analyse rigorously what there is. Here people reproach me: When you practice criticism, you are also obliged to say how one should make it better. To my mind, this is incontrovertibly a bourgeois prejudice. Many times in history it so happened that the very works which pursued purely theoretical goals transformed consciousness and thereby also social reality. If, today, we follow a direct call to act, this act will not be performed in an empty space—it will be an act within the hegemonic ideological co-ordinates: those who “really want to do something to help people” get involved in {undoubtedly honourable} exploits like *Medecins sans frontiers*, Greenpeace, feminist and anti-racist campaigns, which are all not only tolerated but even supported by the media, even if they seemingly encroach on economic territory (for example, denouncing and boycotting companies which do not respect ecological conditions, or use child labour) – they are tolerated and supported as long as they do not get too close to a certain limit. This kind of activity provides the perfect example of interpassivity? Of doing things not in order to achieve something, but to prevent something from really happening, really changing. All this frenetic humanitarian, politically correct, etc. activity fits the formula of “Let’s go on changing something all the time so that, globally, things will remain the same!” If standard cultural studies criticize capitalism, they do so in the coded way that exemplifies Hollywood liberal paranoia: the enemy is “the system”, the hidden “organization”, the anti-democratic “conspiracy” not simply capitalism and state apparatuses. The problem with this critical stance is not only that it replaces concrete social analysis with a struggle against abstract paranoid fantasies, but that – in a typical paranoid gesture – it unnecessarily redoubles social reality, as if there were a secret Organization behind the “visible” capitalist and state organs. What we should accept is that there is no need for a secret “organization-within-an-organization”: the “conspiracy” is already in the “visible” organization as such, in the capitalist system, in the way the political space and state apparatuses work.

## AT: Capitalism Inevitable

### **Positioning Capitalism as Inevitable Naturalizes it, Making it Harder To Resist—This is the Ultimate Propaganda of Capitalist Society**

Istavan MESZAROS, University of Sussex, *Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition*, 1995 p. 94

THE self-serving slogan of 'there is no alternative' is often coupled with an equally tendentious clause of self-justification which proclaims that 'in the real world there can be no alternative to the advocated course of action (or inaction). This proposition is supposed to be a self-evident truth, automatically exempting all those who continue to assert it from inconveniencing themselves with the burden of proof.

Yet, the moment we ask the question, what sort of 'real world' are they talking about, it becomes clear that it is an utterly fictitious one. For the structural defects and explosive antagonisms of the world in which we actually happen to live are apologetically denied or blindly disregarded by those who expect us to believe that in the 'real world' there is no alternative to the meek acceptance of the conditions necessary for the trouble-free functioning of the global capital system.

In the name of reason, common sense, and 'real politics' we are invited to resign ourselves to the existing state of affairs, no matter how destructive its antagonisms. For within the parameters of the established order — eternalized as the rational framework of the fundamentally unalterable 'real world', with 'human nature' and its corresponding ideal reproductive instrumentality: the 'market mechanism', etc. — no solutions can be envisaged to the ubiquitous contradictions.

Thus we are expected to pretend to ourselves that classes and class contradictions no longer exist or no longer matter. Accordingly, the only viable course of action in the thus postulated 'real world' is supposed to be to ignore, or to 'explain away' the evidence of structural instability provided by our own eyes, wishfully sweeping under an imaginary carpet the chronic problems and crisis symptoms of growing severity with which our social order confronts us every day.



AT: Cap Sustainable
---------------------

**Transition From Capitalism is Inevitable—It is Unsustainable, The Aff Can Only Risk Delaying**  
**Wallerstein '11, Immanuel, Senior research scholar at Yale University, “THE GLOBAL ECONOMY WON'T**  
**RECOVER, NOW OR EVER”** [http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/01/02/unconventional\\_wisdom?page=0,9](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/01/02/unconventional_wisdom?page=0,9) ) IG

Virtually everyone everywhere—economists, politicians, pundits -- agrees that the world has been in some kind of economic trouble since at least 2008. And virtually everyone seems to believe that in the next few years the world will somehow "recover" from these difficulties. After all, upturns always occur after downturns. The remedies recommended vary considerably, but the idea that the system shall continue in its essential features is a deeply rooted faith. But it is wrong. All systems have lives. When their processes move too far from equilibrium, they fluctuate chaotically and bifurcate. Our existing system, what I call a capitalist world-economy, has been in existence for some 500 years and has for at least a century encompassed the entire globe. It has functioned remarkably well. But like all systems, it has moved steadily further and further from equilibrium. For a while now, it has moved too far from equilibrium, such that it is today in structural crisis. The problem is that the basic costs of all production have risen remarkably. There are the personnel expenses of all kinds -- for unskilled workers, for cadres, for top-level management. There are the costs incurred as producers pass on the costs of their production to the rest of us -- for detoxification, for renewal of resources, for infrastructure. And the democratization of the world has led to demands for more and more education, more and more health provisions, and more and more guarantees of lifetime income. To meet these demands, there has been a significant increase in taxation of all kinds. Together, these costs have risen beyond the point that permits serious capital accumulation. Why not then simply raise prices? Because there are limits beyond which one cannot push their level. It is called the elasticity of demand. The result is a growing profit squeeze, which is reaching a point where the game is not worth the candle. What we are witnessing as a result is chaotic fluctuations of all kinds -- economic, political, sociocultural. These fluctuations cannot easily be controlled by public policy. The result is ever greater uncertainty about all kinds of short-term decision-making, as well as frantic realignments of every variety. Doubt feeds on itself as we search for ways out of the menacing uncertainty posed by terrorism, climate change, pandemics, and nuclear proliferation. The only sure thing is that the present system cannot continue. The fundamental political struggle is over what kind of system will replace capitalism, not whether it should survive. The choice is between a new system that replicates some of the present system's essential features of hierarchy and polarization and one that is relatively democratic and egalitarian. The extraordinary expansion of the world-economy in the postwar years (more or less 1945 to 1970) has been followed by a long period of economic stagnation in which the basic source of gain has been rank speculation sustained by successive indebtednesses. The latest financial crisis didn't bring down this system; it merely exposed it as hollow. Our recent "difficulties" are merely the next-to-last bubble in a process of boom and bust the world-system has been undergoing since around 1970. The last bubble will be state indebtednesses, including in the so-called emerging economies, leading to bankruptcies. Most people do not recognize -- or refuse to recognize -- these realities. It is wrenching to accept that the historical system in which we are living is in structural crisis and will not survive. Meanwhile, the system proceeds by its accepted rules. We meet at G-20 sessions and seek a futile consensus. We speculate on the markets. We "develop" our economies in whatever way we can. All this activity simply accentuates the structural crisis. The real action, the struggle over what new system will be created, is elsewhere.

## AT: Capitalism Solves Environment

### **The Logic of Capital Ignores the Reality of Environmental Systems and Encourages Their Destruction for the Basis of Profit**

Joel Kovel, Alger Hiss Professor, Social Studies, Bard College, *THE ENEMY OF NATURE: THE END OF CAPITALISM OR THE END OF THE WORLD*, 2002, p. 81

One last tendency that keeps capitalists from dealing adequately with the ecological crisis deserves mention. Aside from logical styles or personal passions, we may assess the capacities for judgement of this ruling class. Needless to say, this has to be fairly sound in certain respects if an individual is to ascend the capitalist hierarchy. That is, the tycoon needs to be able to distinguish between his grandiose and aggressive desires and what the real situation will bear. However, this principle applies only to those areas in which profitability is the criterion. Here the capitalist's powers are brought to bear and the results are usually impressive. But where, as with the ecological crisis, the capitalist is simply in over his head and his instrumental kind of thinking and mechanical materialism necessarily misconstrue the real situation, then he is prone to especially great distortions. This is because of his grandiosity, his immersion in the discourse of 'spin control', public relations and other kinds of manipulation, and also from an induced character trait quite common among those who live by the market, namely, a kind of 'optimistic denial'. The capitalist has to be thoroughly realistic on one level, but insofar as he is immersed in commodity exchange, he is also subject to a high degree of wishful thinking. Success in the imponderable market depends a great deal upon instilling confidence and assurance that such and such will really sell, for whether such and such actually sells depends in part upon whether people believe in it. This attitude, so essential to huckstering and 'hustling customers', is normally balanced by shrewdness of one kind or another. However, where, as with the ecological crisis, the shrewdness is misplaced because the situation is incomprehensible, then the all-too-human traits of denying reality and resorting to wishful thinking come to the fore. Since no one in fact can predict the outcome of the ecological crisis, or any of its constituent ecosystemic threads, the way is left open for optimistic denial, in short, minimization of the dangers, and inadequate responses taken for opportunistic motives rather than from a real appreciation of the problem.

## AT: Capitalism Will Adapt to Environmental Changes

### The Basic Assumption That Capitalism Will Adapt to Changing Natural Environments is Nonsense

Ted Trainer, "Natural Capitalism Cannot Overcome Resource Limits," 2002

(<http://socialwork.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/D50NatCapCannotOvercome.html>)

The basic problem Lovins' works sets here is to do with how representative are the cases he discusses. It is one thing to focus on those instances where large reductions are possible but there may be many others where only lesser or negligible gains are likely. The question is what reduction can be made in the resource use and ecological impact of the total economy, and little light is thrown on this unless the potential for reductions in most of its components can be demonstrated and then added. Natural Capitalism leaves us quite unclear about what the reductions discussed and implied might add up to and therefore what proportion of current resource use and environmental impact technical advance might be capable of bringing about. It certainly does not provide a good case in support of the above claim that overall factor 10 reductions can be made.

In this context the discussion of specific products and industries where spectacular achievements are possible can be misleading. It is conceivable that where wastes are within the potential access of a firm, as is the case with carpet supply, a high proportion of the material can be recycled. However much waste is in a form wherein many metals, plastics and organic substances are mixed together making retrieval of particular items difficult. Even sorting before dumping leaves many items, such as electronic circuits, in which materials have been integrated in ways that make sorting problematic. Again the question is how indicative of the general situation are these selected impressive cases. The early gains are the easiest.

## AT: Elites Kill Solvency

### **Elites Cannot Stand in the Way of a Successful Revolution—The Alternative Can Overcome their Obstinance**

Joel Jay Kassiola, San Fran State, "Questions to Ponder in Understanding the Modern Predicament", Explorations in Environmental Political Theory, 2003

As we reflect upon the causes of the potentially lethal modern predicament, we face the central question of how modern societal transformation will occur. This raises the concomitant, apparently insurmountable, obstacle of the current elite's opposition to such change in values and social institutions: How will the rich accept the lower material levels necessitated by environmental limits, and create a more just world order through a redistribution of wealth and power? The unhappy experience and knowledge of increasing environmental degradation with threats to all planetary life should move the industrial rich to recognize the self-defeating and unsatisfactory nature of modern values and social practices. They may come to accept the necessity of a new, postmodern social order, one not so characterized by the ideologies of capitalism, industrialism, and Hobbesianism. In this new order citizens—including the rich—can have more leisure time to experience and contemplate the nonmaterial and more fulfilling aspects of the human condition, like nature. Nature's value to humans, as Goodin tells us, lies in directing humans to something "outside themselves," something "larger than themselves," that "locates the self." Of course, extensive social learning will have to occur if such a radical change is to occur, but it is precisely such a type of change that is needed to realize sustainability and justice. The crucial role of such social learning to societal transformation is emphasized by both Milbrath's and Pirages's contributions. An urgent question remains: What specific agent can transform modern society to an environmentally consistent, moral, and satisfying social order? Several contributors note the role of disappointment, or tragedy (in Oscar Wilde's sense of "emptiness after success") on the recognition of mistaken goals. We experience alienation as we work harder and longer "getting and spending" yet increase our anguish and dissatisfaction with life. Some of our authors have remarked about the Wildean tragedy, or irony, of the most materially successful society in world history having success be its downfall. However, just as Zimmerman admonishes us to preserve what is positive about modernity (for example, freedom from the shackles of feudalism and increased productivity to meet human biological needs), I feel compelled to remind the reader of Paehlke's discussion of globalization, especially as it pertains to the global industrial elites and the effective spread of their ideology of growthmania and endless consumption. These elites control the global mass media of communications and direct the expanding reach of increasingly large and powerful transnational corporations. The dynamics of how the current hegemonic rule of the industrial corporate behemoths will be undermined has yet to be written, posing a significant challenge to all environmental political theorists, environmental researchers and activists (similar to Zimmerman's unforeseen "caterpillar into a butterfly" transformation analogy). As Paehlke fears, we merely may be moving forward between cars on a train as it moves backward without changing its direction! But even the most destination-minded train engineer will stop, change direction, and reassess her/his stated objective when they run out of fuel, see disastrous circumstances ahead, and realize the train's projected destination does not exist!

**AT: Gibson-Graham****Gibson-Graham's Argument is Based on a Fear of Essentialism—Unless they Prove a True Politics of Anti-Capitalism Accept the Alternative's Radical Resistance**

Barbara Epstein, dept History of Consciousness, UC Santa Cruz, NEW POLITICS Winter, 1998  
(<http://www.wpunj.edu/newpol/issue24/epstei24.htm>)

"The question becomes," she writes, "what to do with the monster? Should we refine it, cut it down to size, render it once more acceptable, unremarkable, invisibly visible?" No, she writes; for in doing so, we might lose sight of its grotesqueness. Capitalism -- refined and redefined -- would still be capable of "relegating noncapitalism to a space of necessary weakness and defeat." Gibson-Graham calls for an anti-essentialist project of "supplanting the discourse of capitalist hegemony with a plurality and heterogeneity of economic forms." (ibid. pp. 8-10) Capitalist production, then, should be seen as only one set of economic practices among many -- not as an integral system encompassing and subordinating "non-capitalist" forms such as self-employment and household economy, but as something on a par with these and other alternative forms. By this account, the U.S. economy is no longer capitalist. Instead, it is a site of diverse economic practices -- none with more power to shape society than any others. Capitalism has been brought under control; discursively, at least, it is largely de-fanged. We can challenge capitalism, it seems, by refusing to believe that it holds sway over our society. Gibson-Graham argues her political economy on grounds that her commitment to an anti-essentialist perspective requires it -- not that it makes reality more intelligible.

**AT: Gibson-Graham (Alternative Solvency)****We Must Have a Totalizing Image of Capitalism to Potentially Challenge It—Failing to Present Such a Picture Guarantees Extinction**James Herod, Getting Free, 2004 ([http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\\_g/Strate/GetFre/06.htm](http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman_g/Strate/GetFre/06.htm))

It is time to try to describe, at first abstractly and later concretely, a strategy for destroying capitalism. This strategy, at its most basic, calls for pulling time, energy, and resources out of capitalist civilization and putting them into building a new civilization. The image then is one of emptying out capitalist structures, hollowing them out, by draining wealth, power, and meaning out of them until there is nothing left but shells.

This is definitely an aggressive strategy. It requires great militancy, and constitutes an attack on the existing order. The strategy clearly recognizes that capitalism is the enemy and must be destroyed, but it is not a frontal attack aimed at overthrowing the system, but an inside attack aimed at gutting it, while simultaneously replacing it with something better, something we want.

Thus capitalist structures (corporations, governments, banks, schools, etc.) are not seized so much as simply abandoned. Capitalist relations are not fought so much as they are simply rejected. We stop participating in activities that support (finance, condone) the capitalist world and start participating in activities that build a new world while simultaneously undermining the old. We create a new pattern of social relations alongside capitalist relations and then we continually build and strengthen our new pattern while doing every thing we can to weaken capitalist relations. In this way our new democratic, non-hierarchical, non-commodified relations can eventually overwhelm the capitalist relations and force them out of existence.

This is how it has to be done. This is a plausible, realistic strategy. To think that we could create a whole new world of decent social arrangements overnight, in the midst of a crisis, during a so-called revolution, or during the collapse of capitalism, is foolhardy. Our new social world must grow within the old, and in opposition to it, until it is strong enough to dismantle and abolish capitalist relations. Such a revolution will never happen automatically, blindly, determinably, because of the inexorable, materialist laws of history. It will happen, and only happen, because we want it to, and because we know what we're doing and know how we want to live, and know what obstacles have to be overcome before we can live that way, and know how to distinguish between our social patterns and theirs.

But we must not think that the capitalist world can simply be ignored, in a live and let live attitude, while we try to build new lives elsewhere. (There is no elsewhere.) There is at least one thing, wage-slavery, that we can't simply stop participating in (but even here there are ways we can chip away at it). Capitalism must be explicitly refused and replaced by something else. This constitutes War, but it is not a war in the traditional sense of armies and tanks, but a war fought on a daily basis, on the level of everyday life, by millions of people. It is a war nevertheless because the accumulators of capital will use coercion, brutality, and murder, as they have always done in the past, to try to block any rejection of the system. They have always had to force compliance; they will not hesitate to continue doing so. Nevertheless, there are many concrete ways that individuals, groups, and neighborhoods can gut capitalism, which I will enumerate shortly.

We must always keep in mind how we became slaves; then we can see more clearly how we can cease being slaves. We were forced into wage-slavery because the ruling class slowly, systematically, and brutally destroyed our ability to live autonomously. By driving us off the land, changing the property laws, destroying community rights, destroying our tools, imposing taxes, destroying our local markets, and so forth, we were forced onto the labor market in order to survive, our only remaining option being to sell, for a wage, our ability to work.

It's quite clear then how we can overthrow slavery. We must reverse this process. We must begin to reacquire the ability to live without working for a wage or buying the products made by wage-slaves (that is, we must get free from the labor market and the way of living based on it), and embed ourselves instead in cooperative labor and cooperatively produced goods.

Another clarification is needed. This strategy does not call for reforming capitalism, for changing capitalism into something else. It calls for replacing capitalism, totally, with a new civilization. This is an important distinction, because capitalism has proved impervious to reforms, as a system. We can sometimes in some places win certain concessions from it (usually only temporary ones) and win some (usually short-lived) improvements in our lives as its victims, but we cannot reform it piecemeal, as a system.

Thus our strategy of gutting and eventually destroying capitalism requires at a minimum a totalizing image, an awareness that we are attacking an entire way of life and replacing it with another, and not merely reforming one way of life into something else. Many people may not be accustomed to thinking about entire systems and social orders, but everyone knows what a lifestyle is, or a way of life, and that is the way we should approach it.

The thing is this: in order for capitalism to be destroyed millions and millions of people must be dissatisfied with their way of life. They must want something else and see certain existing things as obstacles to getting what they want. It is not useful to think of this as a new ideology. It is not merely a belief-system that is needed, like a religion, or like Marxism, or Anarchism. Rather it is a new prevailing vision, a dominant desire, an overriding need. What must exist is a pressing desire to live a certain way, and not to live another way. If this pressing desire were a desire to live free, to be autonomous, to live in democratically controlled communities, to participate in the self-regulating activities of a mature people, then capitalism could be destroyed. Otherwise we are doomed to perpetual slavery and possibly even to extinction.

## AT: Ivory Tower/Intellectuals Bad

### Intellectuals are Crucial to the Possibility of Revolution and Consciousness Spreading

James Cannon, Founder of Socialist Workers Party, The Treason of the Intellectuals, 1947

(<http://www.marxists.org/archive/cannon/works/1947/intellect.htm>)

The workers, too, need the forces of enlightenment and progress which a section of the educated classes, as individuals, can supply and did supply so notably in Europe and old Russia. It will happen here, too. There can be no doubt that the further disintegration of capitalist society in the United States will impel a section of the intelligentsia to revolt. This revolt will acquire great significance when it leads them, as it must, to join forces with the labour movement in the revolutionary struggle for the socialist transformation of society, which alone can save humanity from the abyss. This union of revolutionary intellectuals with the best representatives of militant labour will open up a perspective of great promise for the leadership of the coming American revolution. But this promise, from the side of the intellectuals, depends entirely and exclusively on the new generation now approaching maturity. The workers will make the emancipating revolution in any case, but the task will be easier if the young intellectuals contribute reinforcements to the leadership in time. For that the workers must look forward, not backward.

**AT: Methodological Criticism Bad****ONTOLOGY AND EPISTEMOLOGY ARE INSEPERABLE—IF YOUR METHOD IS WRONG, SO IS YOUR ENTIRE POLITICAL UNIVERSE:**

HOLLIS & SMITH 96 [martin & Steve, Prof's Int'l Relations, [A Response: Why Epistemology Matters](#)]

Now, there are two problems with this: first it seems a very odd way of distinguishing between ontology and epistemology. It implies, inter alia, that historians who write biographies are epistemologists, whilst historians who survey periods and movements are ontologists. That strikes us as nonsensical. The second problem is that they fail to see the extent to which Giddens's claims are only possible precisely because he has already made an epistemological choice. Indeed, this choice is spelt out very clearly in the preface to the book Jabri and Chan cite. Giddens explicitly rejects structural sociology, seeing the focus of social theory as being on the actors and their interpretations of situations. In this critically important way he has already dealt with epistemology! Far from downplaying the role of epistemology in favour of ontology, his stress on ontology can only be made because he has already decided what kinds of criteria allow us to judge what kinds of things exist in the social world. For Giddens, the appropriate epistemological position is one of what we call 'Understanding'. He defines social structures as the rules and resources that are grounded in the knowledgeable activities of human agents. Structures are not external to actors but are internal to them. Here, Giddens shows just how important epistemology is: it is only because he is working in the right-hand column of our two-by-two matrix that he can say that epistemology is secondary. After all, if you settle epistemological questions by fiat you are then likely to see them as settled! Thus, whilst Giddens's work is seen by Jabri and Chan as promoting a conception of structuration that overcomes questions of epistemology by concentrating



## AT: Permutation

### **The Permutation is an Attempt to Mask the Radical Potential of the Alternative's Challenge to Capitalism—The Methodological Nature of the Criticism Cannot Be Permuted**

Stephen Tumino, Professor of English at Pitt, "What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More than Ever", Red Critique, 2001

Orthodox Marxism has become a test-case of the "radical" today. Yet, what passes for orthodoxy on the left—whether like Smith and Žižek they claim to support it, or, like Butler and Rorty they want to "achieve our country" by excluding it from "U.S. Intellectual life" ("On Left Conservatism"), is a parody of orthodoxy which hybridizes its central concepts and renders them into flexodox simulations. Yet, even in its very textuality, however, the orthodox is a resistance to the flexodox. Contrary to the common-sensical view of "orthodox" as "traditional" or "conformist" "opinions," is its other meaning: ortho-dox not as flexodox "hybridity," but as "original" "ideas." "Original," not in the sense of epistemic "event," "authorial" originality and so forth, but, as in chemistry, in its opposition to "para," "meta," "post" and other ludic hybridities: thus "ortho" as resistance to the annotations that mystify the original ideas of Marxism and hybridize it for the "special interests" of various groups.

The "original" ideas of Marxism are inseparable from their effect as "demystification" of ideology—for example the deployment of "class" that allows a demystification of daily life from the haze of consumption. Class is thus an "original idea" of Marxism in the sense that it cuts through the hype of cultural agency under capitalism and reveals how culture and consumption are tied to labor, the everyday determined by the workday: how the amount of time workers spend engaging in surplus-labor determines the amount of time they get for reproducing and cultivating their needs. Without changing this division of labor social change is impossible. Orthodoxy is a rejection of the ideological annotations: hence, on the one hand, the resistance to orthodoxy as "rigid" and "dogmatic" "determinism," and, on the other, its hybridization by the flexodox as the result of which it has become almost impossible today to read the original ideas of Marxism, such as "exploitation"; "surplus-value"; "class"; "class antagonism"; "class struggle"; "revolution"; "science" (i.e., objective knowledge); "ideology" (as "false consciousness"). Yet, it is these ideas alone that clarify the elemental truths through which theory ceases to be a gray activism of tropes, desire and affect, and becomes, instead, a red, revolutionary guide to praxis for a new society freed from exploitation and injustice.

Marx's original scientific discovery was his labor theory of value. Marx's labor theory of value is an elemental truth of Orthodox Marxism that is rejected by the flexodox left as the central dogmatism of a "totalitarian" Marxism. It is only Marx's labor theory of value, however, that exposes the mystification of the wages system that disguises exploitation as a "fair exchange" between capital and labor and reveals the truth about this relation as one of exploitation. Only Orthodox Marxism explains how what the workers sell to the capitalist is not labor, a commodity like any other whose price is determined by fluctuations in supply and demand, but their labor-power—their ability to labor in a system which has systematically "freed" them from the means of production so they are forced to work or starve—whose value is determined by the amount of time socially necessary to reproduce it daily. The value of labor-power is equivalent to the value of wages workers consume daily in the form of commodities that keep them alive to be exploited tomorrow. Given the technical composition of production today this amount of time is a slight fraction of the workday the majority of which workers spend producing surplus-value over and above their needs. The surplus-value is what is pocketed by the capitalists in the form of profit when the commodities are sold. Class is the antagonistic division thus established between the exploited and their exploiters. Without Marx's labor theory of value one could only contest the after effects of this outright theft of social labor-power rather than its cause lying in the private ownership of production. The flexodox rejection of the labor theory of value as the "dogmatic" core of a totalitarian Marxism therefore is a not so subtle rejection of the principled defense of the (scientific) knowledge workers need for their emancipation from exploitation because only the labor theory of value exposes the opportunism of knowledges (ideology) that occult this exploitation. Without the labor theory of value socialism would only be a moral dogma that appeals to the sentiments of "fairness" and "equality" for a "just" distribution of the social wealth that does the work of capital by naturalizing the exploitation of labor under capitalism giving it an acceptable "human face."

## AT: Permutation

### **Particularism is a Disad to the Permutation—Translating Resistance Through A Single Issue Allows the Permutation to Be Identified, Coopted and Destroyed By Capital**

Istavan MESZAROS, University of Sussex, Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition, 1995 p. 40

However, historically/epochally defined non-integrability, no matter how important for the future, cannot guarantee success on its own. Switching the allegiance of disappointed socialists from the working class to so-called 'new social movements' (praised now in opposition to, and by discarding altogether the emancipatory potential of, labour) must be considered, therefore, far too premature and naive. Single issue movements, even if they fight for non-integrable causes, can be picked off and marginalized one by one, because they cannot lay claim to representing a coherent and comprehensive alternative to the given order as a mode of social metabolic control and system of societal reproduction. This is what makes focusing on the socialist emancipatory potential of labour more important today than ever before. For labour is not only non-integrable (in contrast to some historically specific political manifestations of labour, like reformist social democracy, which may be rightly characterized as integrable and indeed in the last few decades also completely integrated), but — precisely as the only feasible structural alternative to capital — can provide the comprehensive strategic framework within which all 'single issue' emancipatory movements can successfully make their common cause for the survival of humanity.

## AT: Permutation

### **The Perm is Worse than the Plan, It Suggests That Capitalism Can Take Responsibility For Its Own Issues and Hijacks any Possibility For Alternative Solvency**

Istavan MESZAROS, University of Sussex, *Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition*, 1995 p. 930

THE difficulty is that the 'moment' of radical politics is strictly limited by the nature of the crises in question and the temporal determinations of their unfolding. The breach opened up at times of crisis cannot be left open forever and the measures adopted to fill it, from the earliest steps onwards, have their own logic and cumulative impact on subsequent interventions. Furthermore, both the existing socioeconomic structures and their corresponding framework of political institutions tend to act against radical initiatives by their very inertia as soon as the worst moment of the crisis is over and thus it becomes possible to contemplate again 'the line of least resistance'. And no one can consider 'radical restructuring' the line of least resistance, since by its very nature it necessarily involves upheaval and the disconcerting prospect of the unknown. No immediate economic achievement can offer a way out of this dilemma so as to prolong the life-span of revolutionary politics, since such limited economic achievements made within the confines of the old premises — act in the opposite direction by relieving the most pressing crisis symptoms and, as a result, reinforcing the old reproductive mechanism shaken by the crisis.

As history amply testifies, at the first sign of 'recovery', politics is pushed back into its traditional role of helping to sustain and enforce the given socio-economic determinations. The claimed 'recovery' itself reached on the basis of the 'well tried economic motivations', acts as the self-evident ideological justification for reverting to the subservient, routine role of politics, in harmony with the dominant institutional framework. Thus, radical politics can only accelerate its own demise (and thereby shorten, instead of extending as it should, the favourable 'moment' of major political intervention) if it consents to define its own scope in terms of limited economic targets which are in fact necessarily dictated by the established socioeconomic structure in crisis.

## AT: Political Action Key

### **The Intervention of Political Action in Response to These Crises is Precisely the Wrong Choice—Such Tempered and Calculated Reforms Will Only Drive Politics Away From the Radical**

Istavan MESZAROS, University of Sussex, *Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition*, 1995 p. 930

THE difficulty is that the 'moment' of radical politics is strictly limited by the nature of the crises in question and the temporal determinations of their unfolding. The breach opened up at times of crisis cannot be left open forever and the measures adopted to fill it, from the earliest steps onwards, have their own logic and cumulative impact on subsequent interventions. Furthermore, both the existing socioeconomic structures and their corresponding framework of political institutions tend to act against radical initiatives by their very inertia as soon as the worst moment of the crisis is over and thus it becomes possible to contemplate again 'the line of least resistance'. And no one can consider 'radical restructuring' the line of least resistance, since by its very nature it necessarily involves upheaval and the disconcerting prospect of the unknown.

No immediate economic achievement can offer a way out of this dilemma so as to prolong the life-span of revolutionary politics, since such limited economic achievements made within the confines of the old premises — act in the opposite direction by relieving the most pressing crisis symptoms and, as a result, reinforcing the old reproductive mechanism shaken by the crisis.

As history amply testifies, at the first sign of 'recovery', politics is pushed back into its traditional role of helping to sustain and enforce the given socio-economic determinations. The claimed 'recovery' itself reached on the basis of the 'well tried economic motivations', acts as the self-evident ideological justification for reverting to the subservient, routine role of politics, in harmony with the dominant institutional framework. Thus, radical politics can only accelerate its own demise (and thereby shorten, instead of extending as it should, the favourable 'moment' of major political intervention) if it consents to define its own scope in terms of limited economic targets which are in fact necessarily dictated by the established socioeconomic structure in crisis.

## AT: Utopian Alternatives Bad

### Utopianism is Crucial to the Success of the Movement—Focusing Only On Technical Aspects Gets the Alternative Lost in Bourgeois Detail

Nick Dyer-Witherford, Professor at Western Ontario, *Cyber Marx: Cycles and Circuits of Struggle in High Technology Capitalism*, 1999

Today, however, mere invocation of the “real movement” is not immediately encouraging. A vast block of despair and cynicism consolidates the dominance of the world market. The catastrophe of state socialism has left millions convinced that, however appalling the trajectory of capitalism may be, there is simply no alternative to it. This resignation is reinforced by information capital’s managers—those whom Pierre Bourdieu has called the “kings of technocracy”—in whose discourse any attempt to think beyond the “realities” of global competition and automating technology is instantly dismissed as tantamount to delirium. As Massimo De Angelis observes, such “technicism” serves as the “ultimate legitimization” for capitalism, making its economic order into “a great Leviathan, the unchangeable and unquestionable constraint facing all political and cultural subjectivity, a constraint that subsumes everything.” De Angelis argues that in the face of this conceptual closure there is an urgent need to “recover a utopian discourse, in thought as well as in antagonistic and constitutive practice.” He observes that, “through an interesting play on words, the word utopia is defined in English as nowhere—no place. But this could also be read as now here—here and now,” De Angelis goes on to distinguish between “realizable” futures, that “presuppose a pre-conceived plan which must be realized by subordinating to the plan all the people who don’t like it,” and “actualizable” futures, where “whatever is actualizable is already existing in a virtual way, where virtuality is a dimension of reality.” He urges utopian invention, “not as the alternative model, not as a party program or a plan in search of subjects to subordinate” but as “an open and inclusive horizon of thought, antagonistic practice and communication” that can “show different possible horizons and contrast them to the poverty of the mainstream one.

## AT: Transition Wars

### ELITES WON'T BLOCK CHANGE—IF AWARE OF IMPENDING DOOM, FEAR OF EXTINCTION WILL SPUR MINDSET CHANGE TO A SUSTAINABLE LIFESTYLE

KASSIOLA (Dean at San Francisco State) 2003

[Joel Jay, "Questions to Ponder in Understanding the Modern Predicament", Explorations in Environmental Political Theory, ed. Kassiola, M.E. Sharpe //mac-tjc]

As we reflect upon the causes of the potentially lethal modern predicament, we face the central question of how modern societal transformation will occur. This raises the concomitant, apparently insurmountable, obstacle of the current elite's opposition to such change in values and social institutions: How will the rich accept the lower material levels necessitated by environmental limits, and create a more just world order through a redistribution of wealth and power? The unhappy experience and knowledge of increasing environmental degradation with threats to all planetary life should move the industrial rich to recognize the self-defeating and unsatisfactory nature of modern values and social practices. They may come to accept the necessity of a new, postmodern social order, one not so characterized by the ideologies of capitalism, industrialism, and Hobbesianism. In this new order citizens—including the rich—can have more leisure time to experience and contemplate the nonmaterial and more fulfilling aspects of the human condition, like nature. Nature's value to humans, as Goodin tells us, lies in directing humans to something "outside themselves," something "larger than themselves," that "locates the self." Of course, extensive social learning will have to occur if such a radical change is to occur, but it is precisely such a type of change that is needed to realize sustainability and justice. The crucial role of such social learning to societal transformation is emphasized by both Milbrath's and Pirages's contributions. An urgent question remains: What specific agent can transform modern society to an environmentally consistent, moral, and satisfying social order? Several contributors note the role of disappointment, or tragedy (in Oscar Wilde's sense of "emptiness after success") on the recognition of mistaken goals. We experience alienation as we work harder and longer "getting and spending" yet increase our anguish and dissatisfaction with life. Some of our authors have remarked about the Wildean tragedy, or irony, of the most materially successful society in world history having success be its downfall. However, just as Zimmerman admonishes us to preserve what is positive about modernity (for example, freedom from the shackles of feudalism and increased productivity to meet human biological needs), I feel compelled to remind the reader of Paehlke's discussion of globalization, especially as it pertains to the global industrial elites and the effective spread of their ideology of growthmania and endless consumption. These elites control the global mass media of communications and direct the expanding reach of increasingly large and powerful transnational corporations. The dynamics of how the current hegemonic rule of the industrial corporate behemoths will be undermined has yet to be written, posing a significant challenge to all environmental political theorists, environmental researchers and activists (similar to Zimmerman's unforeseen "caterpillar into a butterfly" transformation analogy). As Paehlke fears, we merely may be moving forward between cars on a train as it moves backward without changing its direction! But even the most destination-minded train engineer will stop, change direction, and reassess her/his stated objective when they run out of fuel, see disastrous circumstances ahead, and realize the train's projected destination does not exist! [p. 185-187]

## AT: New Technology Helps the Oppressed

**The Idea that New Technology Will be Put to the Benefit of the Poor Ignores the Reality of Capital—It Will Inevitably Serve the Interests of the Ruling Class Only**

Robert Wilkie, Professor of English at UW La Crosse, "The Daydreams of iPod Capitalism," RedCritique, Winter-Spring 2005 (<http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2005/thedaydreamsofipodcapitalism.htm>)

Poster's "blurry" cultural vision of boundless consumption—which is, in fact, the social view of the global capitalist for whom the whole world is available for purchase—is an attempt to mediate the increasingly heightened contradictions between owners and workers. It is on these terms that he oscillates between a "celebratory" reading of the Internet, in which he argues that the "new" capitalism rests on the dematerializing the means of production, allowing "every receiver of a message to [also] produce a message, every individual to disseminate messages to a mass" (126), and a "critical" position which acknowledges that technological developments thus far tend to "favor the wealthy and the educated everywhere" (49). Having denied, however, that a class analysis of the Internet holds any explanatory value for a society based upon the "magic" of consumption, Poster advances an analysis in which society is instead defined by the relationship of the "info-rich" and the "info-poor". He writes, "one must recognize that the Internet creates new invisibilities, filters out those who are not wired to its machinic tentacles, disempowers those who cannot afford the startup fees, those who belong to communities that reject modernizing technologies or are too poor to distribute them" (127). Yet, insofar as all own the means of production in the new economy, even this division is presumed to be short lived as it follows from this argument that such a division over access to information exists only until the full implementation of the cyber-society finally occurs. Poster explains while "capitalism enters the domain of the net [...] with a vengeance" (45), it is ultimately the Internet which swallows capitalism. He writes, "digital technology renders the reproduction of information easy and cheap. So the logic of the internet is the more the better, and more is no more costly than less, a logic that flies in the face of traditional free enterprise economics" (46) and ultimately "calls capitalism into question in the domain of cultural objects" (54). But it is precisely this obsessed reading of technology as the eliminator of class conflict and the creator of ethical communities of cultural sharing that has made the Internet the "new" concept of global capitalism and so useful to the interests of Big Business. While we are witness to dramatic advances in the technologies of health, communication, transportation and commodity production—developments which could be used to raise the living standards of all—capitalism twists the potential of scientific and technological progress away from the meeting everyone's needs and towards the accumulation of vast fortunes for the owners. As one recent study found, rather than ameliorating class divisions, the "tech" years have seen the gap between the rich and the poor double in the United States (Browning C2) and such divisions literally determine who lives and who dies. For example, while nightly news shows act as virtual mouthpieces for the pharmaceutical companies, touting the latest lifestyle drugs and "extreme" plastic surgery techniques, capitalism reduces basic healthcare technologies such as dentistry and annual checkups to the privilege of a few (Park C05). Technology, in other words, cannot solve the problem of class inequality but only heightens the conflict between capital and labor because under the capitalist system technological developments are used solely for the production of private wealth for the few who own and control them.

## AT: Framework

**YOU SHOULD BE SKEPTICAL OF THEIR PHILOSOPHICAL OBJECTIONS TO MARXISM; THE RULING CLASS IS OBSESSED WITH ANSWERING IT AND DO SO BY APPEALING TO FALLACIOUS CATEGORIES OF NATURALISM AND PERMANENCE**

**Sewell '02** (Rob, member International Marxist Tendency, "What is Dialectical Materialism?")

[http://www.marxist.com/Theory/study\\_guide1.html](http://www.marxist.com/Theory/study_guide1.html), uw/mjs)

Official bourgeois ideology conducts a relentless war against Marxism, which it correctly sees as a mortal danger to capitalism. The bourgeois scribes and professors pour out a continual stream of propaganda in an attempt to discredit Marxism - particularly the dialectic. This has especially been the case since the collapse of the Berlin Wall, and the ferocious ideological offensive against Marxism, communism, revolution, and such like. "Marxism is dead", they repeatedly proclaim like some religious incantation. But Marxism refuses to lie down in front of these witch doctors! Marxism reflects the unconscious will of the working class to change society. Its fate is linked to that of the proletariat. The apologists of capitalism, together with their shadows in the labour movement, constantly assert that their system is a natural and permanent form of society. On the other hand, the dialect asserts that nothing is permanent and all things perish in time. Such a revolutionary philosophy constitutes a profound threat to the capitalist system and therefore must be discredited at all cost. This explains the daily churning out of anti-Marxist propaganda. But each real step forward in science and knowledge serves to confirm the correctness of the dialectic. For millions of people the growing crisis of capitalism increasingly demonstrates the validity of Marxism. The objective situation is forcing working people to seek a way out of the impasse. "Life teaches", remarked Lenin. Today, to use the famous words of the Communist Manifesto, "A spectre is haunting Europe, the spectre of communism."



## AT: Framework

**The aff's interpretation of fiat misunderstands policy making—this turns their predictability and education arguments and also links to our critique**

**CLAUDE 1988**

(Inis, Professor of Government and Foreign Affairs, University of Virginia, States and the Global System, pages 18-20)

This view of the state as an institutional monolith is fostered by the notion of sovereignty, which calls up the image of the monarch, presiding over his kingdom. Sovereignty emphasizes the singularity of the state, its monopoly of authority, its unity of command and its capacity to speak with one voice. Thus, France wills, Iran demands, China intends, New Zealand promises and the Soviet Union insists. One all too easily conjures up the picture of a single-minded and purposeful state that decides exactly what it wants to achieve, adopts coherent policies intelligently adapted to its objectives, knows what it is doing, does what it intends and always has its act together. This view of the state is reinforced by political scientists' emphasis upon the concept of policy and upon the thesis that governments derive policy from calculations of national interest. We thus take it for granted that states act internationally in accordance with rationally conceived and consciously constructed schemes of action, and we implicitly refuse to consider the possibility that alternatives to policy-directed behaviour may have importance—alternatives such as random, reactive, instinctual, habitual and conformist behaviour. Our rationalistic assumption that states do what they have planned to do tends to inhibit the discovery that states sometimes do what they feel compelled to do, or what they have the opportunity to do, or what they have usually done, or what other states are doing, or whatever the line of least resistance would seem to suggest. Academic preoccupation with the making of policy is accompanied by academic neglect of the execution of policy. We seem to assume that once the state has calculated its interest and contrived a policy to further that interest, the carrying out of policy is the virtually automatic result of the routine functioning of the bureaucratic mechanism of the state. I am inclined to call this the Genesis theory of public administration, taking as my text the passage: 'And God said, Let there be light: and there was light'. I suspect that, in the realm of government, policy execution rarely follows so promptly and inexorably from policy statement. Alternatively, one may dub it the Pooh-Bah/Ko-Ko theory, honouring those denizens of William S. Gilbert's Japan who took the position that when the Mikado ordered that something be done it was as good as done and might as well be declared to have been done. In the real world, that which a state decides to do is not as good as done; it may, in fact, never be done. And what states do, they may never have decided to do. Governments are not automatic machines, grinding out decisions and converting decisions into actions. They are agglomerations of human beings, like the rest of us inclined to be fallible, lazy, forgetful, indecisive, resistant to discipline and authority, and likely to fail to get the word or to heed it. As in other large organizations, left and right governmental hands are frequently ignorant of each other's activities, official spokesmen contradict each other, ministries work at cross purposes, and the creaking machinery of government often gives the impression that no one is really in charge. I hope that no one will attribute my jaundiced view of government merely to the fact that I am an American—one, that is, whose personal experience is limited to a governmental system that is notoriously complex, disjointed, erratic, cumbersome and unpredictable. The United States does not, I suspect, have the least effective government or the most bumbling and incompetent bureaucracy in all the world. Here and there, now and then, governments do, of course perform prodigious feats of organization and administration: an extraordinary war effort, a flight to the moon, a successful hostage-rescue operation. More often, states have to make do with governments that are not notably clear about their purposes or coordinated and disciplined in their operations. This means that, in international relations, states are sometimes less dangerous, and sometimes less reliable, than one might think. Neither their threats nor their promises are to be taken with absolute seriousness. Above all, it means that we students of international politics must be cautious in attributing purposefulness and responsibility to governments. To say that the United States was informed about an event is not to establish that the president acted in the light of that knowledge; he may never have heard about it. To say that a Soviet pilot shot down an airliner is not to prove that the Kremlin has adopted the policy of destroying all intruders into Soviet airspace; one wants to know how and by whom the decision to fire was made. To observe that the representative of Zimbabwe voted in favour of a particular resolution in the United Nations General Assembly is not necessarily to discover the nature of Zimbabwe's policy on the affected matter; Zimbabwe may have no policy on that matter, and it may be that no one in the national capital has ever heard of the issue. We can hardly dispense with the convenient notion that Pakistan claims, Cuba promises, and Italy insists, and we cannot well abandon the formal position that governments speak for and act on behalf of their states, but it is essential that we bear constantly in mind the reality that governments are never fully in charge and never achieve the unity, purposefulness and discipline that theory attributes to them—and that they sometimes claim.

**AT: Transportation Infrastructure is Socialist****Transportation Infrastructure Was Supported by the First of the American Capitalists, It is Fundamentally a Tool to Enable Capital Exchange**

Iowa State Daily, "Belding: Road, rail infrastructure is part of orthodox capitalism," December 6th, 2011  
([http://www.iowastatedaily.com/opinion/article\\_24724abe-1a13-11e1-b3e3-001cc4c03286.html](http://www.iowastatedaily.com/opinion/article_24724abe-1a13-11e1-b3e3-001cc4c03286.html))

Building roads and railways, however, provides a space in which people can move and trade. In ancient times, this investment in creating a place for business consisted of building a new forum. Now, we build roads.

It's not a matter of being Democrat or Republican, conservative or liberal. Investment in infrastructure goes across party lines. Historically speaking, there have been many reasons for building such projects as the Interstate Highway System. Chances are good that you use it every break to get home. I use it every day to drive down here from my home.

President Dwight Eisenhower, a Republican, noticed from his military training that projects from the 1930s to create a national system of roads, already under way, should be expanded. National defense was not the only impetus, however. Increased traffic from automobiles wore on existing highways inadequate to new demands, and the interstate highways have proved vital in evacuating people from natural disasters such as hurricanes.

In 2009 dollars, federal spending on transportation and water infrastructure during Eisenhower's second term averaged \$25.4 billion. Kennedy's average was \$40.4 billion. Johnson's was \$48.7 billion. Nixon's was \$44.5 billion. Ford's was \$47.8 billion. Carter's was \$60.2 billion. Reagan's was \$53.3 billion. George H. W. Bush's was \$55.2 billion. Clinton's was \$60.6 billion, and George W. Bush's average spending on transportation and water infrastructure was the highest, at \$67.8 billion. Ideologically, government support of public works — roads, canals and the like — is not a new idea. Adam Smith advocated government support of infrastructure (as well as the judicial branch, a standing army and public education for the poor) when he laid the groundwork for the capitalism that so defines our way of life. Funding infrastructure is, in classical conservative thought, orthodox.

If government's job for supporting the economy is to get out of business' way, why wouldn't we want to provide the means for economic exchanges to take place? If government's job is to ensure conditions in which businesses can thrive, why wouldn't we support more roads and railways? Lowering taxes has the same point, and putting people to work building things that will lead to other people working is not a bad solution to economic malaise.

## Aff—Capitalism Sustainable

### Capitalism is Sustainable—The Predictions of Marxist Authors are Wrong—We Should Function Ethically and Progressively Inside It

**Kimball**, Managing Editor of New Critierion, **2K1** (Roger, "The new anti-Americanism", *The New Critierion*, Vol. 20, No. 2, October, <http://www.newcritierion.com/archive/20/oct01/empire.htm>)

I suspect that part of the reason *Empire* is such a hit in the academy is its superior insulation. Hardt and Negri have sealed every point of ingress: no hint of reality is allowed to seep in. The single greatest embarrassment to Marxist theory has always been the longevity of capitalism. It was supposed to implode from "internal contradictions" long ago. But here it is 2001 and capitalism is still going strong and making the world richer and richer. Attempting to explain this is the greatest test of a Marxist's ingenuity. Here is how Hardt and Negri handle the problem: As we write this book and the twentieth century draws to a close, capitalism is miraculously healthy, its accumulation more robust than ever. How can we reconcile this fact with the careful analyses of numerous Marxist authors at the beginning of the century who point to the imperialist conflicts as symptoms of an impending ecological disaster running up against the limits of nature? They offer three hypotheses for this imponderable situation. One, that capitalism has reformed itself and so is no longer in danger of collapse (an option they dismiss out of hand). Two, that the Marxist theory is right except for the timetable: "Sooner or later the once abundant resources of nature will run out." Three—well, it is a little difficult to say what the third hypothesis is. It has to do, they say, with the idea that capitalism's expansion is "internal" rather than "external," that it "subsumes not the noncapitalist environment but its own capitalist terrain— that is, that the subsumption is no longer *formal* but *real*." I won't attempt to explain this for the simple reason that I haven't a clue about what it means. Is there any important option they have neglected? Could it, just possibly, be that the "careful analyses of numerous Marxist authors" was just plain *wrong*? This is a possibility apparently too awful to contemplate, for Hardt and Negri never raise it.

## Aff—Must Work Within Capitalism

### There is No Possibility for Revolution Opposed to Capital on the Horizon—The Matrix Reveals that the Best Solution is Not the Sexiest One—True Radicalism is Only Possible Via Action Within the System

Slavoj Žižek 2006 ("Reloaded Revolutions Lacan.com, <http://www.lacan.com/zizreloaded.htm>)

To put it in the terms of the good old Marxist couple infrastructure-superstructure: one should take into account the irreducible duality of, on the one hand, the "objective" material socio-economic processes taking place in reality as well as, on the other hand, the politico-ideological process proper. What if the domain of politics is inherently "sterile," a theatre of shadows, but nonetheless crucial in transforming reality? So, although economy is the real site and politics a theater of shadows, the main fight is to be fought in politics and ideology. Take the disintegration of the Communist power in the last years of 1980s: although the main event was the actual loss of state power by the Communists, the crucial break occurred at a different level - in those magic moments when, although normally Communists were still in power, people all of a sudden lost their fear and no longer took the threat seriously; so, even if "real" battles with the police continued, everyone somehow knew that "the game is over". The title *The Matrix Reloaded*, is thus quite appropriate: if part 1 was dominated by the impetus to exit the Matrix, to liberate oneself from its hold, part 2 makes it clear that the battle has to be won WITHIN the Matrix, that one has to return to it.

In *The Matrix Reloaded*, the Wachowski brothers thus consciously raised the stakes, confronting us with all the complications and confusions of the process of liberation. In this way, they put themselves in a difficult spot: they now confront an almost impossible task. If *The Matrix Revolutions* were to succeed, it would have to produce nothing less than the appropriate answer to the dilemmas of revolutionary politics today, a blueprint for the political act the Left is desperately looking for. No wonder, then, that it miserably failed - and this failure provides a nice case for a simple Marxist analysis: the narrative failure, the impossibility to construct a "good story," which signals a more fundamental social failure.

The first sign of this failure is simply the contract with spectators broken. The ontological premise of *The Matrix* (part one) is a straightforward realistic one: there is the "real reality" and the virtual universe of the Matrix which can be entirely explained in the terms of what went on in reality. *Matrix Revolutions* break these rules: in it, the "magic" powers of Neo and Smith extend into "real reality" itself (Neo can stop bullets there also, etc.). Is this not like a detective novel in which, after a series of complex clues, the proposed solution would be that the murderer has magic capacities and was able to commit his crime violating laws of our reality? The reader would feel cheated - the same as in *Matrix Revolutions*, where the predominant tone is the one of faith, not knowledge. But even within this new space there are inconsistencies. In the film's final scene, the meeting of the couple who makes the deal, the (feminine) Oracle and the (masculine) Architect, takes place within the virtual reality or the Matrix - why? They are both mere computer programs, and the virtual interface is here only for the human gaze - computers themselves do not communicate through the screen of the virtual imaginary, they directly exchange digital bites... For which gaze is then this scene staged? Here, the film "cheats" and is taken over by the imaginary logic.

The third failure is a more narrative one: the simplicity of the proposed solution. Things are not really explained, so that the final solution is more like the proverbial cutting of the Gordian knot. This is especially deplorable with regard to the many interesting dark hints in *Matrix Reloaded* (Morpheus as a dangerous paranoid, the corruption of the ruling elite of the Zion City) which are left unexplored in *Revolutions*. The only interesting new aspect of *Revolutions* - the focus on interworld, neither Matrix nor reality - is also underdeveloped.

The key feature of the entire Matrix series is the progressive need to elevate Smith into the principal negative hero, a threat to the universe, a kind of negative of Neo. Who is effectively Smith? A kind of allegory of Fascist forces: a bad program (lone wild, autonomized, threatening the Matrix. So the lesson of the film, is, at its best, that of an anti-Fascist struggle: the brutal thugs Fascist developed by the Capital to control workers (by the Matrix to control humans) run out of control, and the Matrix has to enlist the help of humans to crush them in the same way liberal capital had to enlist the help, of Communists, its mortal enemy, to defeat Fascism... (Perhaps, from today's political perspective, a more appropriate model would have been to imagine Israel on the verge of destroying Arafat and PLO, and then making a deal with them for a truce if PLO destroys Hamas who run out of control... However, *Revolutions* colors this anti-Fascist logic with potentially Fascist elements: although the (feminine) Oracle and the (masculine) Architect are both just programs, their difference is sexualized, so that the film's end is inscribed into the logic of the balance between the feminine and the masculine "principles."

When, at the end of *Matrix Reloaded*, a miracle occurs in reality itself, there are only two ways out left open: either postmodern Gnosticism or Christianity. That is to say, either we shall learn, in part III, that "real reality" itself is just another matrix-generates spectacle, there being no last "real" reality, or we enter the domain of divine magic. However, does, in *Matrix Revolutions*, Neo really turn into a Christ figure? It may look so: at the very end of his duel with Smith, he turns into (another) Smith so that, when he dies, Smith (all the Smiths) is (are) also destroyed... However, a closer look renders visible a key difference: Smith is a proto-Jewish figure, an obscene intruder who multiplies like rats, who runs amok and disturbs the harmony of Humans and Matrix-Machines, so that his destruction enables a (temporary) class truce. What dies with Neo is this Jewish intruder who brings conflict and imbalance; in Christ, or, the contrary, God himself becomes man so that, with the death of Christ, this man (*ecce homo*), God (of beyond) himself also dies. The true "Christological" version of the Matrix trilogy would thus entail a radically different scenario: Neo should have been a Matrix program rendered human, a direct human embodiment of the Matrix, so that, when he dies, the Matrix itself destroys itself.

The ridicule of the final pact cannot but strike the eye: the Architect has to promise the Oracle not only that the machines will no longer fight men who are outside the Matrix, but that those. Humans who want to be set free from the Matrix will be allowed to do it - how will they be given the choice? So, at the end, nothing is really resolved: the Matrix is here, continuing to exploit humans, with no guarantee that another Smith will not emerge; the majority of humans will continue their slavery. What leads to this deadlock is that, in a typical ideological short-circuit, the Matrix functions as a double allegory: for the Capital (machines sucking energy out of us) and for the Other, the symbolic order as such. Perhaps, however - and this would be the only way to (partially, at least) redeem *Revolutions* - there is a sobering message in this very failure of the conclusion of the Matrix series. There is no final solution on the horizon today, Capital is here to stay, and all we can hope for is a temporary truce. That is to say, undoubtedly worse than this deadlock would have been a pseudo-Deleuzian celebration of the successful revolt of the multitude.

**Aff—Alternative→Transition War****The Capitalist State Will Respond to the Alternative With Overwhelming Violence, Producing a Net Worse Result**

**Callinicos** – Professor of European Studies – **2003** (Alex, “An Anti-Capitalist Manifesto”)

The police charged violently. We fought back and I stand by our response as a political fact. Nonetheless, for us to also take up militaristic tactics would be crazy and political suicide. At Genoa there were all the forces of order, the army, the secret services of the eight most powerful – both economically and militarily – nations on the planet. Our movement can't measure up with that type of military power. We would be crushed within three months . . . Two, three years ago we thought at length about how to act in a conflict without it becoming destructive. Our technique was different: we stated publicly what we wanted to do, letting it be known that if the police attacked us, we would defend ourselves only with shields and padding. It was our rule because it was essential that we create conflict and consensus about the objectives that we set up for ourselves. In Genoa we expected that more or less the same thing as usual would happen. They deceived us . . . The police forces used firearms, even though they had assured us that they would not. The right to demonstrate that [Italian Foreign Minister Renato] Ruggiero agreed was an inalienable right was run over under the wheels of the police armoured cars." The right-wing government of Silvio Berlusconi had dramatically altered the rules of the game. In doing so it drew attention to a truth long stressed by classical Marxism –that the state, as concentrated and organized violence, acts as the last line of defence of capitalist property relations. After Genoa, an intense debate developed within the anti-capitalist movement over whether or not it should abandon mass protests altogether for fear of the violence they were attracting, both from the police and from the Black Bloc (which many believed had been infiltrated by agents provocateurs).' But the deeper difficulty posed by Genoa concerned how the movement could confront the centralized power of the capitalist state without reproducing the hierarchical and authoritarian structures it was seeking to challenge. Celebrations of fragmentation and dispersal are of no help whatsoever in addressing this problem.

## Aff-Alternative→Transition War

**Radical attempts to break down capitalism cause nuclear draw-in and extinction**

**Pritchard and Taylor. 78** (Colin, Director of Social Work Studies, University of Bath, Richard K. S., the Department of Adult and Continuing Education, *Social Work: Reform or Revolution*, pg. 105-106)

In our context the crucial questions for the Marxist social worker must be, first, whether social work is a potential vehicle for achieving a heightened socialist consciousness, and second, if it has this potential, how it can be fulfilled. Others on the Left have argued, though, that this radicalizing role is best fulfilled not through the heightening of conflict-oriented class consciousness and the consequent construction of alternative vehicles for socialist transformation, but rather through the adaptation of existing institutions and organizations. By further pressurizing the potentially socialist aspects of existing structures, it is argued, the system can be radicalized through mass, democratic pressure. This view certainly rejects the pluralist assumptions: the unacceptable nature of existing social structure is not disputed—and the need for radical change is as strongly held as it is by 'orthodox Marxists'. It is the means of achieving this change that sharply differentiates these perspectives. The rationale of this approach is based both upon specific social analysis and upon wider political considerations. On the wider political front it can be argued that, whereas it may have been reasonable for Marx to talk prescriptively about the need for decades of civil war, following the clash of social classes, in order to establish a socialist system—to advocate violent conflict in the nuclear age is both irresponsible and unrealistic in socialist terms. Future conflict could not be confined to nationally based conflict but would inevitably involve intervention by the major power blocs. With the proliferation of nuclear weapons amongst some of the middle-range powers the dangers of a nuclear holocaust become even greater. There is thus a need for humanity as a whole to acknowledge its ability, technologically, to self-destruct. Once this has been accepted, the context of the argument for social change is drastically revised: at its extreme, the possibility of massive human annihilation through nuclear conflict may be precipitated by major class conflict. Can Marxists therefore afford to advocate violent revolution in the nuclear age? Such speculations may at first sight seem far removed from the tasks facing social work. But if, as we have argued, the political choice between 'evolutionary' and 'revolutionary' perspectives for social change is highly relevant to social work concerns then the implications of the means of achieving these objectives must also be of direct concern to social workers as to all others involved in 'politically sensitive' areas.

Aff-Gibson-Graham
-------------------

**Totalizing depictions of capitalism preclude the possibility of concrete changes that can challenge the worst aspects of capitalism.**

**Gibson-Graham 06** (The End of Capitalism as We Knew It, pg. 255-257)

What is important here, for my purposes, are not the different metaphors and images of economy and society but the fact that they all confer integrity upon Capitalism. Through its architectural or organismic depiction as an edifice or body, Capitalism becomes not an uncentered aggregate of practices but a structural and systemic unity, potentially co-extensive with the national or global economy as a whole. 11 As a large, durable, and self-sustaining formation, it is relatively impervious to ordinary political and cultural interventions. It can be resisted and reformed but it cannot be replaced, except through some herculean and coordinated struggle. Understood as a unified system or structure, Capitalism is not ultimately vulnerable to local and partial efforts at transformation. Any such efforts can always be subverted by Capitalism at another scale or in another dimension. Attempts to transform production may be seen as hopeless without control of the financial system. Socialisms in one city or in one country may be seen as undermined by Capitalism at the international scale. Capitalism cannot be chipped away at, gradually replaced or removed piecemeal. It must be transformed in its entirety or not at all. Thus one of the effects of the unity of Capitalism is to present the left with the task of systemic transformation. Singularity If the unity of Capitalism confronts us with the mammoth task of systemic transformation, it is the singularity and totality of Capitalism that make the task so hopeless. Capitalism presents itself as a singularity in the sense of having no peer or equivalent, of existing in a category by itself; and also in the sense that when it appears fully realized within a particular social formation, it tends to be dominant or alone. As a sui generis economic form, Capitalism has no true analogues. Slavery, independent commodity production, feudalism, socialism, primitive communism and other forms of economy all lack the systemic properties of Capitalism and the ability to reproduce and expand themselves according to internal laws. 12 Unlike socialism, for example, which is always struggling to be born, which needs the protection and fostering of the state, which is fragile and easily deformed, Capitalism takes on its full form as a natural outcome of an internally driven growth process. Its organic unity gives capitalism the peculiar power to regenerate itself, and even to subsume its moments of crisis as requirements of its continued growth and development. Socialism has never been endowed with that mythic capability of feeding on its own crises; its reproduction was never driven from within by a life force but always from without; it could never reproduce itself but always had to be reproduced, often an arduous if not impossible process. 13 Other modes of production that lack the organic unity of Capitalism are more capable of being instituted or replaced incrementally and more likely to coexist with other economic forms. Capitalism, by contrast, tends to appear by itself. Thus, in the United States, if feudal or ancient classes exist, they exist as residual forms; if slavery exists, it exists as a marginal form; if socialism or communism exists, it exists as a prefigurative form. None of these forms truly and fully coexists with Capitalism. Where Capitalism does coexist with other forms, those places (the so-called Third World, for example, or backward regions in what are known as the "advanced capitalist" nations) are seen as not fully "developed." Rather than signaling the real possibility of Capitalism coexisting with noncapitalist economic forms, the coexistence of capitalism with noncapitalism marks the Third World as insufficient and incomplete. Subsumed to the hegemonic discourse of Development, it identifies a diverse array of countries as the shadowy Other of the advanced capitalist nations. One effect of the notion of capitalist exclusivity is a monolithic conception of class, at least in the context of "advanced capitalist" countries. The term "class" usually refers to a social cleavage along the axis of capital and labor since capitalism cannot coexist with any but residual or prefigurative noncapitalist relations. The presence and fullness of the capitalist monolith not only denies the possibility of economic or class diversity in the present but prefigures a monolithic and modernist socialism - one in which everyone is a comrade and class diversity does not exist.

## Aff-Cap Good-Environment

**Capitalism is vital to stemming environmental degradation --- alt doesn't solve**

**Smith. 93** (Fred L., Jr., President and Founder of the Competitive Enterprise Institute, The Market and Nature, September, <http://cei.org/gencon/019,03108.cfm>)

The world does indeed face a challenge in protecting ecological values. Despite tremendous success in many areas, many environmental concerns remain. The plight of the African elephant, the air over Los Angeles, the hillsides of Nepal, the three million infant deaths from water-borne diseases throughout the world, and the ravaging of Brazilian rain forests all dramatize areas where problems persist and innovative solutions are necessary. Sustainable development theorists claim these problems result from "market failure": the inability of capitalism to address environmental concerns adequately. Free market proponents suggest such problems are not the result of market forces, but rather of their absence. The market already plays a critical role in protecting those resources which are privately owned and for which political interference is minimal. In these instances there are truly sustainable practices. Therefore, those concerned with protecting the environment and ensuring human prosperity should seek to expand capitalism, through the extension of property rights, to the broadest possible range of environmental resources. Our objective should be to reduce, not expand, political interference in both the human and natural environments. Private stewardship of environmental resources is a powerful means of ensuring sustainability. Only people can protect the environment. Politics per se does nothing. If political arrangements fail to encourage individuals to play a positive role, the arrangements can actually do more harm than good. There are tens of millions of species of plants and animals that merit survival. Can we imagine that the 150 or so governments on this planet—many of which do poorly with their human charges—will succeed in so massive a stewardship task? Yet, there are in the world today over five billion people. Freed to engage in private stewardship, the challenge before them becomes surmountable. Sustainable Development and Its Implications The phrase sustainable development suggests a system of natural resource management that is capable of providing an equivalent, or expanding, output over time. As a concept, it is extremely vague, often little more than a platitude. Who, after all, favors non-sustainable development? The basic definition promoted by Gro Harlem Brundtland, former Prime Minister of Norway and a prominent player at the 1992 Earth Summit, is fairly vague as well: "[S]ustainable development is a notion of discipline. It means humanity must ensure that meeting present needs does not compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." In this sense, sustainability requires that as resources are consumed one of three things must occur: New resources must be discovered or developed; demands must be shifted to more plentiful resources; or, new knowledge must permit us to meet such needs from the smaller resource base. That is, as resources are depleted, they must be renewed. Many assume that the market is incapable of achieving this result. A tremendous historical record suggests exactly the opposite. Indeed, to many environmental "experts," today's environmental problems reflect the failure of the market to consider ecological values. This market-failure explanation is accepted by a panoply of political pundits of all ideological stripes, from Margaret Thatcher to Earth First! The case seems clear. Markets, after all, are short-sighted and concerned only with quick profits. Markets undervalue biodiversity and other ecological concerns not readily captured in the marketplace. Markets ignore effects generated outside of the market, so-called externalities, such as pollution. Since markets fail in these critical environmental areas, it is argued, political intervention is necessary. That intervention should be careful, thoughtful, even scientific, but the logic is clear: Those areas of the economy having environmental impacts must be politically controlled. Since, however, every economic decision has some environmental effect, the result is an effort to regulate the whole of human activity. Thus, without any conscious decision being made, the world is moving decisively toward central planning for ecological rather than economic purposes. The Montreal Protocol on chlorofluorocarbons, the international convention on climate change, the convention on biodiversity, and the full range of concerns addressed at the UN Earth Summit—all are indicative of this rush to politicize the world's economies. That is unfortunate, for ecological central planning is unlikely to provide for a greener world. Rethinking the Market Failure Paradigm The primary problem with the market-failure explanation is it demands too much. In a world of pervasive externalities—that is, a world where all economic decisions have environmental effects—this analysis demands all economic decisions be politically managed. The world is only now beginning to recognize the massive mistake entailed in economic central planning; yet, the "market failure" paradigm argues that we embark on an even more ambitious effort of ecological central planning. The disastrous road to serfdom can just as easily be paved with green bricks as with red ones. That markets "fail" does not mean that governments will "succeed." Governments, after all, are susceptible to special interest pleadings. A complex political process often provides fertile ground for economic and ideological groups to advance their agendas at the public expense. The US tolerance of high-sulfur coal and the massive subsidies for heavily polluting "alternative fuels" are evidence of this problem. Moreover, governments lack any means of acquiring the detailed information dispersed throughout the economy essential to efficiency and technological change. More significantly, if market forces were the dominant cause of environmental problems then the highly industrialized, capitalist countries should suffer from greater environmental problems than their centrally-managed counterparts. This was once the conventional wisdom. The Soviet Union, it was argued, would have no pollution because the absence of private property, the profit motive, and individual self-interest would eliminate the motives for harming the environment. The opening of the Iron Curtain exploded this myth, as the most terrifying ecological horrors ever conceived were shown to be the Communist reality. The lack of property rights and profit motivations discouraged efficiency, placing a greater stress on natural resources. The result was an environmental disaster.



## Aff-Framework

### Policy analysis should precede discourse – most effective way to challenge power

Jill Taft-Kaufman, Speech prof @ CMU, 1995, Southern Comm. Journal, Spring, v. 60, Iss. 3, "Other Ways",

The postmodern passwords of "polyvocality," "Otherness," and "difference," unsupported by substantial analysis of the concrete contexts of subjects, creates a solipsistic quagmire. The political sympathies of the new cultural critics, with their ostensible concern for the lack of power experienced by marginalized people, aligns them with the political left. Yet, despite their adversarial posture and talk of opposition, their discourses on intertextuality and inter-referentiality isolate them from and ignore the conditions that have produced leftist politics--conflict, racism, poverty, and injustice. In short, as Clarke (1991) asserts, postmodern emphasis on new subjects conceals the old subjects, those who have limited access to good jobs, food, housing, health care, and transportation, as well as to the media that depict them. Merod (1987) decries this situation as one which leaves no vision, will, or commitment to activism. He notes that academic lip service to the oppositional is underscored by the absence of focused collective or politically active intellectual communities. Provoked by the academic manifestations of this problem Di Leonardo (1990) echoes Merod and laments: Has there ever been a historical era characterized by as little radical analysis or activism and as much radical-chic writing as ours? Maundering on about Otherness: phallocentrism or Eurocentric tropes has become a lazy academic substitute for actual engagement with the detailed histories and contemporary realities of Western racial minorities, white women, or any Third World population. (p. 530) Clarke's assessment of the postmodern elevation of language to the "sine qua non" of critical discussion is an even stronger indictment against the trend. Clarke examines Lyotard's (1984) *The Postmodern Condition* in which Lyotard maintains that virtually all social relations are linguistic, and, therefore, it is through the coercion that threatens speech that we enter the "realm of terror" and society falls apart. To this assertion, Clarke replies: I can think of few more striking indicators of the political and intellectual impoverishment of a view of society that can only recognize the discursive. If the worst terror we can envisage is the threat not to be allowed to speak, we are appallingly ignorant of terror in its elaborate contemporary forms. It may be the intellectual's conception of terror (what else do we do but speak?), but its projection onto the rest of the world would be calamitous....(pp. 2-27) The realm of the discursive is derived from the requisites for human life, which are in the physical world, rather than in a world of ideas or symbols.(4) Nutrition, shelter, and protection are basic human needs that require collective activity for their fulfillment. Postmodern emphasis on the discursive without an accompanying analysis of how the discursive emerges from material circumstances hides the complex task of envisioning and working towards concrete social goals (Merod, 1987). Although the material conditions that create the situation of marginality escape the purview of the postmodernist, the situation and its consequences are not overlooked by scholars from marginalized groups. Robinson (1990) for example, argues that "the justice that working people deserve is economic, not just textual" (p. 571). Lopez (1992) states that "the starting point for organizing the program content of education or political action must be the present existential, concrete situation" (p. 299). West (1988) asserts that borrowing French post-structuralist discourses about "Otherness" blinds us to realities of American difference going on in front of us (p. 170). Unlike postmodern "textual radicals" who Rabinow (1986) acknowledges are "fuzzy about power and the realities of socioeconomic constraints" (p. 255), most writers from marginalized groups are clear about how discourse interweaves with the concrete circumstances that create lived experience. People whose lives form the material for postmodern counter-hegemonic discourse do not share the optimism over the new recognition of their discursive subjectivities, because such an acknowledgment does not address sufficiently their collective historical and current struggles against racism, sexism, homophobia, and economic injustice. They do not appreciate being told they are living in a world in which there are no more real subjects. Ideas have consequences. Emphasizing the discursive self when a person is hungry and homeless represents both a cultural and humane failure. The need to look beyond texts to the perception and attainment of concrete social goals keeps writers from marginalized groups ever-mindful of the specifics of how power works through political agendas, institutions, agencies, and the budgets that fuel them.

**Aff—Transportation Infrastructure Not Capitalist****Transportation Infrastructure Funding is Fundamentally Socialist—There is No Link**

The New IQ, Knowledge Blog, “Unspoken Realities About Capitalism and Socialism in Democracy-Centered Republics,” 2010

(<http://www.thenewiq.com/integritywatch-blog/what-they-dont-want-you-know-about-capitalism-socialism>)

Do you know the real difference between socialism and capitalism? Quite a number of politicians and pundits today are counting on you NOT knowing, so they can manipulate you into believing whatever serves them and their ideology for you to believe. Here, in the spirit of spin-busting, are the secrets about capitalism and socialism that those particular pundits and politicians don't want you to know.

Capitalism has each person pay only for the cost of whatever they choose to purchase. Not more, not less. In contrast, socialism spreads among financially capable citizens the cost of projects or services that a society (or a group) needs in order to function.

Capitalism works best with purchases you alone are free to make as an exercise of your personal freedom. Socialism works best with costs connected with infrastructures deemed necessary for the common good.

Do you believe in emergency services like police, fire, paramedics, military? Emergency services are forms of socialism.

Do you believe in epidemic prevention infrastructures like sewers, garbage removal, water purification, etc? Public health strategies are forms of socialism.

Do you believe in the importance of transportation infrastructure, such as properly maintained roadways, public transportation, and air traffic control? Transportation infrastructure maintenance is a form of socialism.

Do you believe in insurance? Yes, even health insurance, and in fact all insurance, is a form of socialism. Why? Because it spreads costs evenly among everyone in an insurance category even though each individual uses uneven amounts of their health coverage.

These are but a handful of many examples of how socialism is an unavoidable part of democracy-centered republics. Here's the truth about capitalism, socialism, and the U.S. Constitution: The Constitution established a country that places equal emphasis on individual freedom and the common good. It requires our government to be the steward of this vision as a servant to we the people. In our society, capitalism has been the honored financial expression of individual freedom and socialism has been the financial method through which the common good has generally been funded.